

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 508.—APRIL, 1931.

Art. 1.—THE DECLINE AND FALL OF SOCIALISM.

1. *Principles of Political Economy.* By John Stuart Mill. Two vols. Longmans, 1848.
2. *The Man versus The State.* By Herbert Spencer. Williams and Norgate, 1884.
3. *Fabian Essays in Socialism.* By G. Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, William Clarke, Sydney Olivier, Annie Besant, Graham Wallas, Hubert Bland. The Fabian Society, 1889.
4. *Social Theory.* By G. D. H. Cole. 2nd Edition. Methuen, 1921.
5. *Socialism : Critical and Constructive.* By The Rt Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald. Revised Edition. Cassells, 1924.

And other works.

MANKIND is largely swayed by action and reaction. The main influence upon nineteenth-century thought, whether by way of sympathy or antipathy, was the French Revolution. About the time when this broke out, England was ripe for revolutionary change, which, however, would probably have been carried out without serious violence. Adam Smith and other writers, who were strongly influenced by the Physicocrats and Rousseau, were attacking the old commercial system and urging the abolition of restrictions. Pitt, a reforming Minister, was securely in power, and he had avowedly legislated on the principles of Adam Smith, and had he been left to pursue his course undisturbed, would in all probability have introduced Parliamentary Reform. At the same time the Industrial Revolution was proceeding apace in

Vol. 256.—No. 508.

England, and was effecting such profound changes that theories both in economics and politics inevitably came up for revision. Further, the writings of Bentham, no less than those of Adam Smith, were calling for a complete change in law and custom.

The change that was due did not at the time mature owing to the political reaction against the French Revolution, but the trend of opinion was liberal, and political reform was only delayed. When that came about in 1832, economic reform soon followed. Power had been entrusted to the middle class and consequently legislation tended to favour that class. However, the tendency was mitigated by the territorial aristocracy, whose influence remained very considerable, who also had almost a monopoly of the high offices. Against the general will of the aristocracy many Free Trade measures were carried, but, on the other hand, they were able to promote legislation for the benefit of labour, which was opposed to the presumed interests of the manufacturers. The result was somewhat anarchic and strongly reprobated by all who had no direct interest in buying or selling or rents. Novelists, as Dickens; independent thinkers, as Carlyle and Ruskin; religious men, as Charles Kingsley and F. D. Maurice; and poets, as Tennyson and Mrs Browning, gave voice to the general discontent which was felt by all disinterested and humane minds. In fact, the proletariat, as that body is now called, had been forgotten. The history of the English landless labourer (and the *landed* labourer has for many generations been negligible in numbers) is calamitous. Deprived by the Reformation of the protection of the Church, he was left at the mercy of the landlord. His condition slowly improved between 1600 and 1800. This was due to certain general conditions which favoured him. The countryman had communal rights of grazing and other advantages. Village life was organised in a fashion that was not inequitable, and there was work and subsistence for all who were willing to work. We know from Defoe that the system of small industries was advantageous to the peasant worker. But agricultural improvements brought about enclosures and swept away the villagers' privileges.

The Industrial Revolution similarly extinguished the hand-loom weaver and herded the workers into factories.

They had little power of combination, for that was forbidden by law. The legislation in favour of workmen's combinations—due to the influence of Francis Place in 1825—was too slight to permit them to be really effective. The Napoleonic Wars raised provisions to famine prices. It was impossible for the candid Whig, Hallam, to deny that the condition of the English labourer in the early nineteenth century was far worse than his lot in the early fifteenth century. Indeed, the record of British work and wages must arouse admiration for the tenacity and courage of the wage-earner, who has contrived to survive the most adverse conditions and who has attained his present comparative prosperity without armed revolt, having endured the worst times patiently, and even cheerfully. The first statesman to take a clear and just view of the subject was the sagacious Disraeli. In 'Sybil' the 'stranger' says :

"Two nations ; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy ; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets ; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws."

"You speak of," said Egremont, hesitatingly, "THE RICH AND THE POOR."

'Sybil' was published in 1845. A few years earlier the author had paid several visits to the North of England, at a time when distress was at its height. Alone among politicians he was able to diagnose the disease, and, when he was in power thirty years later, he provided some remedies. But the wage-earner was left to take care of himself. Some trifling protection might be given to his children (who, however, were left uneducated), but he was allowed to wage an unequal strife with the capitalist. Nothing could be hoped for from the politicians. Whig cum Liberal would only intensify the prevailing conditions. The Tory party, which might have been educated to take some interest in the matter, was barred from office on account of its hankering after Protection. But whereas practical thought doomed him to hard labour and a bare subsistence, there were few contemplative men who could view the anarchy and hardships unmoved.

We have seen what was the attitude of the men of letters. It was generally assumed that 'the laws of Political Economy' had given its benediction to things as they were. But even that science moved. 'The Wealth of Nations' appeared at the same time as the Declaration of Independence; Mill's 'Principles of Political Economy' came out in 1848—the year of Revolution. Both were epoch-making books and both were harbingers of complete change. The first date marks the end of the Middle Ages—the end of status and the beginning of contract. The second marks the beginning of the second act in the Industrial Revolution, which, apparently, is now nearly played out, and the third act cannot be conjectured. The first act saw the triumph of all the nostrums—Parliamentarism, *Laissez-faire*, Free Contract, Free Trade, Freedom of the Press. And discontent was greater than it had even been before. During the second act, the growing scepticism as to the ingredients for Utopia possessing their reputed virtues led to a critical examination of them, and this is largely the history of Socialism.

Few men have done more than John Stuart Mill to promote economic scepticism, and that is really the somewhat unstable foundation of Socialism. He is one of the innumerable examples of the uselessness of trying to expel Nature by a hoe. Brought up in the strictest dogmas, he was expected to be a shining light of Benthamism. But as Dr Johnson's friend always found cheerfulness creeping in, so Mill found human nature. He records in his 'Autobiography' a crisis in his mental history when he was about twenty. He imagined the question put to himself—'Suppose that all your objects in life were realised; that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to, could be completely effected at this very instant: would this be a great joy and happiness to you?' The answer was emphatically, No. He fell into a profound and long-lasting depression, from which he was delivered by accidentally reading a passage in Marmontel, and found 'that I could again find enjoyment, not intense, but sufficient for cheerfulness, in sunshine and sky, in books, in conversation, in public affairs.' The passage certainly seems too slight to cure an aching heart, and undoubtedly it

can only have been the occasion of the amendment in Mill's spirits. The taste for music, which he mentions, and the reading of poetry would be far more effective consolations. A little later he began to read Wordsworth, and that, still more, was 'a medicine for my state of mind.' In his poems, he said, 'I seemed to draw from a source of inward joy, of sympathetic and imaginative pleasure, which could be shared in by all human beings; which had no connection with struggle or imperfection, but would be made richer by every improvement in the physical or social condition of mankind.'

Mill continued his ordinary life, working strenuously to propagate ideas which, as Professor Laski says, 'are only commonplaces now because Mill and his friends were occupied, with full minds and hearts, in making them commonplaces.' He saw a fair proportion of the changes which he had laboured to bring about, and found no great joy or happiness in them, still less did 'all human beings' find satisfaction. Thus, after more than twenty years, Mill's great book reflects much of his early state of mind, modified by experience, and many passages therein, and in subsequent works, have led partisans to claim him as a Socialist. Lord Passfield remarked long ago that 'every edition of Mill's book became more and more Socialistic.' The word *Socialism* is a comparatively new word—it has barely celebrated its hundredth birthday. Perhaps the 'Quarterly Review' was the first to introduce it to standard literature. It appears in two articles of 1839-40, which review two sermons lately preached against 'the persons who have designated them by the appellation of Socialists,' and the articles in general denounce the new and unwelcome portent, which is attributed largely to the perversity and weakness of the Whigs. The essayist took the somewhat unexpected attitude that there was much to be thankful for in the evils of the times, on the ground that the excess and obviousness of the evils would effect their cure. 'Of all these providential circumstances to be humbly and gratefully acknowledged, none appears, humanly speaking, so likely to do good as the permission given to two new curses to rise up for a trial among us, and to startle us into sober reflection—Socialism and Chartism.' Thus was the new cause, or curse, baptised.

To revert to Mill and his treatment of the subject,

which is sufficiently interesting. Undoubtedly, the admirers of that candid publicist took all that Mill had derived from Ricardo, all his treatment of the production of wealth, all his exposition of laissez-faire, and ignored everything which was inconsistent with this. Fawcett, for example, whose work is avowedly based upon Mill, produced a manual of pure Cobdenism. But Mill treated the subject very differently. We may quote his famous declaration. It should be noted that Mill regards Communism, Socialism, and Collectivism as synonymous words. He says: 'If, therefore, the choice was to be made between Communism with all its chances, and the present state of society with all its sufferings and injustices; if the institution of private property necessarily carried with it as a consequence that the produce of labour should be apportioned as we now see it, almost in an inverse ratio to the labour—the largest portions to those who have never worked at all, the next largest to those whose work is almost nominal, and so in a descending scale, the remuneration dwindling as the work grows harder and more disagreeable, until the most fatiguing and exhausting bodily labour cannot count with certainty on being able to earn even the necessities of life; if this, or Communism, were the alternative, all the difficulties, great or small, of Communism would be but as dust in the balance.' For the most part, in his book Mill aims at considering how far the present conditions may be made tolerable by the introduction of new or improved institutions, such as peasant proprietorship, and the like. But in the 'Autobiography,' composed about 1870, and in writings published, like the 'Autobiography,' after his death, which are fragments of a projected work on Socialism, he draws nearer to that school of thought, and has frequently been claimed by partisans of it. He repeats his complaint that 'the reward instead of being proportioned to the labour and abstinence of the individual, is almost in an inverse ratio to it; those who receive the least, labour and abstain the most.' He asserts that 'the working classes are entitled to claim that the whole field of social institutions should be re-examined.' But, as we have seen, nearly all his followers accepted the Benthamism and ignored the 'heresies.'

'Orthodoxy' for a time had full sway in politics. But, as Leslie Stephen observes, 'the over-confidence of the economists only encouraged Socialists to revolt against the whole doctrine.' Carlyle, whose masterpiece, 'Frederick the Great,' has been neglected, was there and everywhere vehement in his objurgations of those who wished to let the Condition of the People improve itself by letting it alone. Describing the means which his hero took to restore war-ravaged Prussia, he thus apostrophises a French nobleman, who admits the value of the remedies, but regrets that the monarch neglected the maxim of buying cheap and selling dear. "'M. le Comte, would there have been in Prussia, for example, any Trade at all, any Nation at all, had it always been left 'Free'? There would have been mere sand and quagmire, and a community of wolves and bisons, M. le Comte. Have the goodness to terminate that Litany, and take up another!'"' Ruskin says: 'I say it sternly and deliberately—much rather would I have him slay his neighbour than cheat him.' Clough, in 'The Latest Decalogue,' says:

'Thou shalt not steal; an empty feat,
When it's so lucrative to cheat.'

And

'Thou shalt not covet, but tradition
Approves all forms of competition.'

Yet so callous was official Liberalism, that Froude had justification in complaining that John Bright, as President of the Board of Trade, actually excused adulteration as a form of competition. A motion had been brought urging legislation to suppress unfair weights and adulteration. Bright said: 'My own impression with regard to this adulteration is that it arises from the very great and perhaps inevitable competition in business, and that to a large extent it is promoted by the ignorance of customers.' This he regarded with complacency as compared with the evils which must arise if the remedies were attempted, when men would be interfered in their business by armies of inspectors, and 'life would not be worth living, and I should recommend them to remove to another country, where they would not be subject to such annoyance.' This is exactly the attitude of the manufacturers in the Coketown of Dickens. 'Whenever a Coketowner felt

he was ill-used—that is to say, whenever he was not left entirely alone, and it was proposed to hold him accountable for the consequences of any of his acts—he was sure to come out with the awful menace, that he would “sooner pitch his property into the Atlantic.” Macaulay called ‘Hard Times’ ‘sullen Socialism.’

The politicians were too strong for their opponents. At the time when Mill was writing his ‘Political Economy,’ the Chartists were causing apprehension. They have been acclaimed by some as forerunners of Socialism, but their ‘points’ were purely political, and might have been advocated by Bentham without any serious inconsistency. Most people consider that the demands in themselves were extremely innocent in comparison with the turmoil which they created. Charles Kingsley said of the Charter: ‘It disappointed me bitterly when I read it. It seemed a harmless cry enough, but a poor, bald, constitution-mongering cry as ever I heard.’ Macaulay declared that five out of the six points were either expedient or unimportant, but that universal suffrage would be catastrophic. ‘If you grant that, the country is lost.’ The result would be ‘one vast spoliation,’ and he drew a harrowing picture of the process. The best that he could hope was that some strong military despot might arise, ‘and that the sword, firmly grasped by some rough hand, may give a sort of protection to the miserable wreck of all that immense prosperity and glory.’ Opinions differ as to the wisdom of the Chartist leaders, but the usual judgment is that they were bunglers. This may be said in favour of their claims to be Socialists, that they represented the wage-earners against the *bourgeoisie*, and cordially detested the middle class anti-Corn Law agitation, which they considered as a red-herring drawn across the track, and calculated to divert attention from more important grievances and also to keep wages down. And, no doubt, they hoped to use universal suffrage as a means of obtaining the nationalisation of various kinds of property.

Chartism vanished in 1848, and its failure was regarded as a tribute to English stability and the effectiveness of Liberal reforms. In 1874 *laissez-faire* was at zenith. At that date Disraeli took office. At last being in possession of real power, he began to attempt to carry

out the policy he had foreshadowed in 'Sybil.' The Liberals had been in office for practically thirty years, and, except for the Education Bill, they had promoted no legislation to improve the condition of the people. Disraeli, acting through Cross, carried a large amount of beneficent Acts. Public health was promoted and the dwellings of artisans improved. Adulteration, which Bright thought inevitable, was checked, Epping Forest and many other open spaces were secured to the public, and an attempt was made to check the pollution of the rivers. Further, the law regarding workmen's combinations was humanised. It may be added that Fawcett opposed the Housing Acts, on the ground that working men are, or ought to be, able to obtain houses for themselves. The Disraeli administration was far more popular with the wage-earners than any Whig or Liberal Government had been.

Between Liberal individualism and Conservative social legislation, combined with prosperous times, the ground was not favourable to Socialism. Karl Marx had long been at work, and there was considerable fermentation on the Continent, but England was irresponsive. At last in the 'eighties (by which time depression of trade had arrived as a stimulus) Socialism was sown in this country, grew up rapidly into premature vigour, and now shows untimely signs of decay if not death. It will, of course, have been observed that this article deals only with English Socialism—a sufficiently formidable task. Except for its theoretic dependence upon Marx, Socialism in England has been self-contained and owes little to the foreigner. Possibly public opinion in this country was first directed to the subject by the 'Progress and Poverty' of Henry George, which dealt with land and the single tax. This was quite congenial to the thought of the time, which was saturated with Mill, for Mill's main interest during his last years had been in land, which seemed to offer a more promising field for experiment than industrial capital. This also was the point at which the Fabians began. However, Continental Socialism at last made itself felt in England, and about 1884 the Social Democratic Federation was founded; in this Hyndman was the most prominent figure.

Hyndman was an interesting personality, but he is

habitually ignored. Certainly it is strange that one of his breezy and genial disposition was attracted by the drab theories of Marx, and perhaps this accounts for his ineffectiveness. He seemed throughout his long career to be perpetually struggling to breathe in an uncongenial atmosphere. He was a man of humour, culture, and common sense, and when the War came, showed himself as national and patriotic as his strongest antagonists. With him for a time was associated William Morris, but they soon parted company. Morris effected little in Socialism; he was really a Young Englander born out of his time. At first the two worked cordially together, but Morris did not share the prevalent belief of his associates that the cause was on the brink of triumph. He says: 'Some of the more ardent disciples look upon Hyndman as too opportunist, and there is truth in that; he is sanguine of speedy change happening somehow, and is inclined to intrigue and the making of a party; towards which end compromise is needed, and the carrying of people who don't really agree with us as far as they will go. As you know, I am not sanguine, and think the aim of Socialists should be the founding of a religion, towards which end compromise is no use, and we only want to have those with us who will be with us to the end.' He soon found himself unable to act with Hyndman. In the early 'eighties the latter had founded the Social Democratic Federation, and Morris joined it and worked hard, doing work which, as Hyndman said, 'others of coarser fibre could do much better than he.' After a time petty quarrels arose, and Morris left the Federation to start a new organisation, which was not successful. Neither Hyndman nor Morris had much political influence upon Socialism. English Socialism was created by the Fabian Society and the Independent Labour Party.

At the time when the Society (1883) began its operations, Socialism may be said to have been dead in England. Such boisterous spirits as Hyndman were looked upon as dangerous and had very little influence. One great service that the Fabians did to Socialism was that they made it respectable. In part, this was because they were not anti-religious. Many of the Fabians were unorthodox in their religious belief, but few were hostile, and nothing in their belief or methods interfered with a whole-hearted

acceptation of Christianity. In fact, Socialism gradually became fashionable with many of the High Church clergy. Thus it had its chance. Continental Socialism, apart from its Marxism, would have frightened away nine-tenths of the possible converts by brandishing its acrid atheism in their faces. But even with that obstacle removed, conditions might well have appeared hopeless. The prevailing political thought was Liberal. In active politics the main forces were, on the one side, Joseph Chamberlain, who was engaged on a propaganda which resembled Socialism, and Lord Randolph Churchill, whose speeches had some affinity to it. Both, however, were really individualists.

Herbert Spencer had succeeded Mill as a popular sage. Probably no philosopher in England has been so widely read. His 'Man v. the State' expounded the starkest Benthamism. He denounced the permeation of the Liberal and Radical party by Socialism, and condemned practically every act of Government that was not designed to protect life and property. The burden of his cry was, 'All Socialism involves slavery.' However cogent his arguments, they were quite ineffective to stem the current which had long been gathering. While he was writing, the franchise had been enlarged, and, whether they liked it or not, politicians were obliged to take the 'worker' into their calculations. The Fabians took advantage of the conditions. If they did not know, at least they followed, Bacon's maxim that man only rules Nature by obeying her. Of Fabianism its historian says: 'It based Socialism, not on the speculations of a German philosopher, but on the obvious evolution of society as we see it around us. It accepted economic science as taught by the accredited British professors; it built up the edifice of Socialism on the foundations of our existing political and social institutions; it proved that Socialism was but the next step in the development of society, rendered inevitable by the changes which followed from the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century.'

At one time it seemed that this anticipation would come true, so thoroughly did the Fabians perform their work. Their object was to instruct, to permeate their countrymen with the doctrine. The 'Essays' were a great success. This was deserved, for the writers stated

their case lucidly and temperately, and the literary style was good. Mr Bernard Shaw is given the credit for this last quality, but he, with his habitual modesty, denies the impeachment; however, it is probably correct, and two of the essays are by his hand. He speaks of 'private property from its source in cupidity to its end in confusion.' This is the standpoint of Mill and his contemporaries, as Carlyle, who, one and all, were appalled by the confusion and incoherence into which Laissez-faire had apparently landed both economics and politics. Mr Shaw also says: 'The modern form of private property is simply a legal claim to take a share of the produce of the national industry without working for it.' This is exactly what Mill repeatedly asserted, and, like him, the Fabians occupy themselves chiefly with land. One great service which they attempted, not without success, was to deliver Socialism from the incubus of Karl Marx, to whom, however, their references are polite—doubtless from a well-grounded apprehension of quarrels with their brother workers in the same field.

Two of the essayists have since become Cabinet Ministers, and most have attained distinction. One of their great successes was Municipal Socialism, which they assiduously preached and practised. They had for many years the London County Council as their happy hunting-ground, and here they were most of all effective in capturing the Liberal party. Lord Passfield complacently pointed out that the country had a Municipal debt of 181,000,000*l.* which was in itself good security for the continuance of their policy. Here he indicates one of the rocks which had helped to wreck his cause; the spectacle of Socialist Ministers ever binding greater burdens of taxation upon the people and still professing to regard spending as a good in itself, has given Socialism an indifferent character in the eyes of the prudent. The essayists are no more successful than their less thoughtful comrades in answering the stock objections—the question of rough and dirty work, of inducing the work-shy to exert themselves, and the encouragement of artists and kindred craftsmen. One affirms that the State could, if it desired, give larger rewards to artists than their patrons now do, thus shattering the doctrine of equality, which, indeed, is so palpably absurd that it always breaks down

in practice. As regards the will to work, Mr Graham Wallas pertinently remarks: 'For more than a century the proletarians of Europe have been challenged by their masters to do as little work as possible.' This, however, does not solve the problem. With simple faith Mrs Besant trusts to 'communal feeling,' considering also that every citizen will have a strong interest in peacefully persuading his neighbour to work.* She adds: 'If there is one vice more certain than another to be unpopular in a Socialist community, it is laziness.' The experiences of West Ham and Poplar do not encourage this optimism.

Like the adherents of Morris, the Fabians soon found themselves in disagreement with the Social Democrats. Mr Hyndman writes of them with a touch of resentment, and, being almost the only one in the whole host of propagandists with a gift of humour, many of his satiric strokes are not ineffective. He rightly says that they were bourgeois, and, for the most part, superior persons, and he is amazed that they fail to see the inevitability of the Marxian theory of value. He might have added that in some respects they were but a later edition of the Liberal party. One of the reforms solemnly set forth in their official programme is the repeal of all duties on 'currants and other dried fruits.' The next year a counterblast—'An Appeal for Liberty,' under the auspices of Auberon Herbert—was published. Herbert was a man who is strangely forgotten, being one of the most delightful personages of his day and also the clearest indication of the tendencies of the time. He devoted the last thirty years of his life to advocating the most extreme form of Herbert Spencer's 'administrative nihilism,'† and, with unfailing pluck, persistence, and good humour, fought each popular and successful interference on the part of Government. He was a cogent and graceful writer, and, unpromising as his general contentions may appear, there was usually shrewd common sense in each detail.

The book had no success comparable to that of the 'Essays'; the writers handicapped themselves by denouncing such harmless and necessary public expenses

* After thirty-six years Mr Ramsay MacDonald can find no more hopeful suggestion.

† Including voluntary taxation.

as free libraries and parks, to say nothing of education. But however skilful they may have been, they were engaged in what was then a hopeless task, in giving battle to the *Zeit Geist* which was then on the side of the Fabians. As has been said, they *permeated*. Not content with the Local Governments, they attacked the Civil Servants. The young Gosses and Alfred Dobsons, who had hitherto devoted their ample leisure and unlimited Government stationery to the pursuits of pure literature, now turned their surplus energy to economic propaganda. Nothing could be more congenial, for the perpetual criticism of Fabianism is that it contemplated a dispensation under which bureaucrats were philosophers and philosophers were bureaucrats. The scholastic profession, which, of course, is virtually a branch of the Civil Service, received their full attention. Thus by the time of the War our public officers and teachers were impregnated with Socialism.

The Liberal-Radical party fell an easy prey. Herbert Spencer already had complained that in practice it was forsaking all its principles, and both in Parliament and the County Councils Liberals approved innumerable measures of Social Reform, and the Conservative party felt the same influence. Even Lord Morley became active in promulgating these programmes. However, an arm was required as well as a brain, and this was found in the Independent Labour Party, which was founded in 1893—mainly the creation of Keir-Hardie, who was the first really militant Socialist to enter the House of Commons. As Mr Ramsay MacDonald says: 'The Social Democratic Federation had failed. Its dogmatic shibboleths roused no interest.' Accordingly the English Socialists, in English fashion, set about to 'do the work that's nearest.' After a time it created a Labour Party out of the Trades Unions. For a considerable time, to all outward appearance, progress was slow. The Liberal Party was paralysed by Home Rule and the Fabians themselves were sharply divided by the Boer War. Imperialism and the long rule of the Conservative party were unfavourable to them.

But in 1906 the Labour party assembled in the House of Commons in considerable strength and had to be seriously considered by the triumphant Liberals. The general impression was that Labour would merely form

a branch of the Liberal party, and, as will be seen, this anticipation was not very far from the truth, although from first to last it has been warmly disclaimed by the Socialists. Although many of the Liberal party were Whig relics or doctrinaire Radicals, the Cabinet at once launched out into a series of legislation which might have satisfied an ideologist, did such folk know how to be satisfied. A complete surrender was at once made to the Left in reversing the Taff Valley verdict, which left the nation helpless against strikes and laid up a plentiful crop of troubles for the Cabinet and its successors. The most remarkable feature of all was the action of Mr Lloyd George. Hitherto, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been the vigilant guardian of the public purse, the staunch champion of economy, the barrier to schemes which demanded heavy expenditure. Mr Lloyd George introduced the most baleful practice of himself, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, introducing schemes of boundless expense, and these he supported by rash and rancorous speeches, far more extravagant than anything that had been heard on Socialist platforms, which did even more public mischief than his reckless expenditure. At the time of the War public life was thoroughly demoralised.

The War need not here be considered. As usual it divided the Socialists. It was believed by many that the period following the Great War—many ancient landmarks, principles, and authorities having been swept away—would be very favourable to revolutionary national changes. The zealots made the old mistake of arguing from Continental experiences. The Russian Revolution, indeed, was conspicuous; but it certainly did not commend Socialism to Great Britain, nor did the rest of Europe afford much encouragement. Nevertheless, in England the principles appeared to prosper. Within seven years we have seen two Socialist Administrations. The first, after a year, was unceremoniously thrust out, on a suspicion of Bolshevist sympathies. The second came into modified power as a result of the feebleness and extravagance of their opponents, who had held power for years without either re-establishing the Constitution, bringing back sanity to India, or correcting the abuses of the dole, and further they added to the already swollen expenditure.

Thus the first Socialist Administration fell on the ground of being ultra-Socialist, and the second came in because the public was disgusted with the watery semi-Socialism of the Conservatives. This does not testify to much enthusiasm for Socialistic principles, and whatever may have then existed has now waxed very cold. The party came in largely on the question of unemployment, for which they blamed their opponents and for which they declared that they themselves had a certain cure. Dr Johnson declared that he would not give a guinea to live under one form of Government rather than another. However this may be, Ministers knew well that employment does not depend upon Cabinets, but upon complicated external forces, and this they now hasten to acknowledge—a late and useless piece of candour. There is this, however, to be said—that unemployment is aggravated when those who control the public purse make no effort to check expenditure, but rather encourage it by practice and precept. So they have done their little bit to help to double the unemployment figures.

As is often the case, English Socialism has failed just when it appeared to have succeeded. It dare not go to the country and has to appeal to the despised Liberals to keep it alive. Whether it goes right or left, it has to fear the Charybdis of alienating its regular supporters or the Scylla of frightening the average elector. As now constituted, it is hardly possible to envisage the Socialist party in power again. We have seen the causes which led to its rise. The causes of its fall are not so evident. The first and most general is the development of Nationalism and Imperialism. In the nineteenth century the most potent political force was the spread of Nationalism: Greece, Belgium, Italy, Germany—and there are many other instances. And this passion is to-day stronger than ever. Each nation desires its own strength and prosperity, and also to extend its territory and influence. Imperialism, which means ruling hosts of partially civilised peoples, who care nothing for Fabianism, is most unfavourable to Socialism.

Secondly, the examples of Communism discredit Socialism. The cruelty and poverty witnessed in Russia are standing warnings. Mussolini delivered Italy from fire and blood which was raging in the land as an effect

of Communism. Various savageries were attempted in Hungary, Germany, and elsewhere. In England, the allocation of power belongs to the man or woman who is not interested in politics and does not know how he will vote. Such people are decided by brightly coloured pictures. Early in the War many young men when asked what had caused them to enlist, replied that it was the atrocities in Belgium. Thirdly, the feebleness of Socialist Cabinets, to which we have just adverted, is obvious. Socialism is no remedy; that has been proved. We are suffering from over-taxation and the remedy is more taxation. In fact, the leading Socialists are in a false position. They are really old-fashioned Liberals who have followed the Socialist tide. Some of them would have entered Parliament as Liberals but for the heavy cost of Liberal seats, and many were originally Liberals. To offer Cobdenism and tariff truces to the unemployed, to own that Government cannot promote prosperity—a flat contradiction of the basic principle of Socialism—to attribute their troubles to trade fluctuations—all this shows that English Socialism is moribund. Mr Clynes is asked to abrogate the death penalty and thus over-ride the law by his individual action. He replies, as Lord John Russell or Lord Palmerston might have done, that his duty is to administer, not to make the law. But this is highly repugnant to his orthodox followers, whose Utopia is a land where a crank or little syndicate of cranks acts and legislates, on its own, in the way they approve.

Fourthly, experience tells against Socialism. The sight of the empty L.C.C. steamboats did more than posters to put an end to the Progressives. We have been lately urged to get rid of all tramways—a cherished Progressive child. At the same time motor-buses and other private transport companies multiply apace. We see the indolence, sometimes the incivility of Government offices. We see the strikes, inflicting temporary and permanent hardships upon all classes. We see the abuses of the dole. Every one of the hard cases which used to be put to the Socialist orator remains unanswered. The lazy will not work, if he can live tolerably without it. What's communal feeling to him or he to communal feeling? Scavenging is no more 'delightful,' and tending machinery no less monotonous than it was when capitalism

had full fling. The only way to get disagreeable tasks performed is to falsify the iron law of labour by persuading the capitalist to give high remuneration, and this Fawcett would have advised the worker to do—if he could. We also see in Australia what waste and detriment Socialism bring, and that to cure the evils capitalist advice and capitalist devices are necessary. Altogether the Socialist pudding makes bad eating.

Lastly, the general temperament of our people, which revolted from the nauseous dose of Marxism, is not congenial even to the milder medicine of Fabianism. Externally, there is a great change. The misery which existed at the time of Marx's diagnosis, the widespread poverty of the 'eighties, do not now exist. When suffering from hardships, the worker was disposed to try remedies, but when tolerably comfortable he is averse. He does not like meddling, and probably is beginning to realise that heavy taxation prejudices his prospects of employment. He respects private property, especially when it is his own. Further, in this generation a great change has come about, which works in the same direction. The place that amusements take in the general life has expanded so greatly as to be almost overwhelming. The cinemas draw crowds. Restaurants are crowded. Newspapers devote much space to sporting intelligence, and games are played extensively and watched by enormous crowds. People thus preoccupied will not give much attention to revolutionary politics.

Thus Socialism, after a rapid rise, hastens to decay. It has engaged a very large share of the national intelligence upon its formulation and development and has been very successful up to a point. But it was planted in uncongenial soil, with not much depth of earth, and now is withering away. To-day our need is not for changes of form, but for good and economical administration, firm government at home and abroad, and the cutting down of taxation. This cannot be provided by Socialism, and hence it is declining towards extinction.

W. A. HRST.

Art. 2.—PERJURY.

Truth. A Lecture delivered before the Royal Medico-Psychological Association as reported in 'The Times' of Nov. 21, 1930. By the Hon. Mr Justice McCardie.

THE problem of perjury is an old one and has always been treated by authority as serious. The bearing of false witness denounced in the ninth of the Ten Commandments, doubtless embraces a good deal more than the giving of false evidence in judicial proceedings; but it certainly includes perjury as we understand the term to-day. It was laid down in the laws of the Twelve Tables that whoever should give false evidence must be thrown from the Tarpeian Rock. Those Tables date from 450 B.C., but they largely embody the pre-existing customary law of Rome. We could probably search any historic system of law and find that in some way or other it had been forced to deal with the problem of perjury.

In our own law, perjury, the giving of false evidence on oath, did not make its appearance for some centuries, the reason being that the giving of evidence before an impartial judicial authority was not an ordinary judicial procedure in the early days of our law. Saxon law concerned itself with penalising false standards in those who were doing judicial work rather than false evidence by those who deliberately misled them. The first statutory mention of perjury in witnesses was in 1486, when perjury was classed with murder and robbery. Temporal penalties were first imposed by our law in 1540, and in 1613, as Coke recorded, it was resolved that perjury in a witness was punishable by the common law. From that time onwards our lawyers wove a mass of subtleties round the offence of perjury, but one satisfactory feature of our law on the subject to-day is that these subtleties have been cleared away by the simple expedient of legislation. To those who take an interest in the form of our law,

‘that codeless myriad of precedent,
that wilderness of single instances,’

it is refreshing to find that the whole of the essential law of perjury is now contained in one Act of Parliament.

Indeed the standard book used by practitioners in the Criminal Law opens its chapter on perjury with the satisfactory statement that: 'the Perjury Act, 1911, has consolidated and simplified the law relating to perjury and rendered it unnecessary to set out much of the matter which appeared in former editions of this work under this head.' English law would be much more intelligible, much less costly to administer, and also a greater influence in the world if such codifying Acts were more abundant. One could almost say that the ideal that Jeremy Bentham propounded has been carried out in the case of our law of perjury.

"Citizen," says the legislator, "what is your condition? Are you a father? Open the chapter 'of Fathers.' Are you an agriculturist? Consult the chapter 'of Agriculturists.' " Thus wrote Bentham, and anyone setting out to commit perjury needs little more than to open the legislative chapter of perjury to ascertain what may happen to him.

The extent to which perjury exists to-day is disputed. In November last Mr Justice McCardie gave the lecture named at the head of this article, and with his 'nearly forty years at the Bar or on the Bench,' he put forward the pessimistic view that 'perjury can never have been more rife than it is at the present time. . . . Perjury exists to-day to a most deplorable extent. . . . I feel compelled to say that it is committed in greater or less degree in a majority of the civil and criminal cases that come on for trial before the courts. . . . The oath is rapidly losing its sanctity.' These strong words caused a mild sensation. A few days later Mr Justice Eve, with his 'fifty years or more experience behind me,' emphatically challenged his brother judge's estimate.* 'The tide of humanity,' he said, 'which ebbs and flows daily through our courts may not possess the attribute of a trout stream, but it is not a sewer, and, although no one would deny that perjury does exist, I am quite satisfied that it does not exist to any large extent and that it is much less to-day than it was thirty or forty years ago.' Then an ex-Lord Chancellor, Lord Buckmaster, joined the fray.† 'I have

* 'The Daily Telegraph,' Dec. 2, 1930.

† 'The Sunday Times,' Dec. 7, 1930.

grave doubts,' he wrote, 'as to the accuracy of the original charge. . . . My experience is now lengthening into many years and the number of occasions I can recall where it could be said with confidence that witnesses were deliberate liars are extremely few. I still believe in the inherent honesty of our race.' Finally Mr Justice Humphreys added his testimony that 'the tendency of the ordinary person is to tell the truth when he goes into the witness-box.'*

These differences of judicial opinion relate only to the degree of gravity. The problem of perjury exists, and no judge or practising lawyer would deny that it is serious. But we must get it to its true perspective. At the outset it is necessary to distinguish clearly between ordinary civil actions on the one hand and criminal and divorce cases on the other. It is obvious that the temptation to give false evidence is greater in criminal and divorce cases than in ordinary civil actions. Mr Justice Eve has frankly accepted a different standard of veracity in criminal and divorce cases. 'Public opinion,' he said, 'will tolerate much from a man who is fighting for his liberty—it may be for his life—and from a man who is defending a woman's honour.' This may not be good morals, but it is true. Perjury in a civil action is less excusable than perjury by a man or woman accused of crime or adultery. If Mr Justice McCardie's statement had been only that perjury is rife in the criminal and divorce courts, few would be inclined to contest it. But the learned judge included 'a majority of the civil cases' as well, and, though many will disagree with the word 'majority,' the fact that a judge of Mr Justice McCardie's experience should make this statement should compel us to examine the whole question closely.

In the first place we must face the fact that our law now gives greater opportunities for the swearing of false evidence than is possible in other judicial systems. Our law of evidence, for use in both civil and criminal cases, used to be full of prohibitions, based on the assumption that evidence likely to be biased by self-interest must be excluded. Judges in olden times were strongly influenced by the idea that even at the risk of barring

* 'The Times,' Jan. 21, 1931.

themselves from access to truth they must protect the souls of those who could give evidence before them. From 1843 onwards Parliament, however, in the face of much judicial objection, insisted on the adoption of the principle urged by Lord Chief Justice Denman that 'the absolute rejection of light because there is a possibility of its leading astray is difficult to be explained on any rational grounds.' The gradual acceptance of this principle necessarily involved the risk of wholesale perjury. But we are not likely to revert to the old idea that light which may mislead must be excluded. Nor is the principle, adopted in 1898, that persons accused of crime shall be allowed to give their own sworn evidence likely to be reversed. It took from 1870, when the House of Commons first approved the principle, to 1898 to secure its acceptance and the argument that this permission encourages perjury was fully debated during those years. The Act of 1898 is the charter of the innocent man, and, while it has undoubtedly increased the probabilities of conviction for the guilty and offered him facilities to perjury himself, few of us to-day take the view that it is the function of the courts to protect a man's soul at the risk of endangering his body. All who know our courts must agree with Mr Justice McCardie that 'the most glaring type of perjury has arisen since the Criminal Evidence Act, 1898. Perjury by a person accused is regarded as being a normal incident of a contested criminal trial.' We must also agree that 'perjury in the Divorce Court by those who entered the witness-box in answer to a charge of misconduct is but little less prevalent than in the courts which administer the criminal law.' These unpleasant facts are the result of the acceptance by Parliament of the principle that every man and woman shall have an opportunity of explaining his own case in any court of law.

These changes in our laws of evidence whereby in both civil and criminal cases those who are immediately concerned are free to give their own evidence on oath still arouses astonishment in those brought up in other systems of law. German law, for instance, not only refuses to allow sworn evidence by a person accused of crime, but still refuses, except in rare cases, to permit the parties to civil litigation (or their near relatives) to give evidence

on oath. The consequence is that perjury is rare in German courts and perjury can still be regarded as one of the most serious of crimes. The punishment for perjury in Germany is forced labour for a minimum of two and a maximum of ten years, and in addition the prisoner loses his civic rights. No extenuating circumstances are allowed to be considered. Here we have a sharp conflict between two conceptions of the duty of the courts. The pre-1843 English system was based, and the present German system is based, upon the assumption that no one must be permitted to give evidence on oath if he will be tempted to place self-interest before truth. On that basis perjury naturally is of rare occurrence. Our modern system is based on the belief that everyone must have every chance of telling the truth on oath, his soul being a matter between himself and God, not a matter for the care of the courts. With us Parliament has deliberately taken the risk of allowing opportunities for perjury rather than to bar access to the witness-box, and few to-day would wish for any reversion to our older methods. We have, therefore, to see whether anything can be done to reduce the volume of perjury while still retaining our modern system of freedom to give evidence.

So far as our criminal courts are concerned it is difficult to see that any steps can be taken to diminish the volume of perjury. Mr Justice McCardie has deplored the small number of prosecutions for this offence, but it is unusual that any prosecution for perjury is possible after a criminal trial. If the accused man secures an acquittal as the result of his perjured evidence, or even of the perjury of his friends, a subsequent trial for perjury must in practice be extremely difficult. If the perjury fails to be effective, the perjury of the accused is swallowed up in his punishment, and only in exceptional cases could his witnesses be successfully prosecuted for perjury. In the divorce courts the position is rendered specially difficult by the factor that, whatever our own personal opinions may be, we must admit that the present law of divorce does not meet with public approval. The divorce court is tackling twentieth-century problems with an equipment of bygone centuries. Parliament has persistently refused to provide us with an adequate code of

marriage and divorce, and our judges have struggled, and are still struggling, to adapt the law to modern conditions, the practical results being considerable uncertainty as to what the law is. The divorce courts, possibly because it is realised how inadequate are the laws that they administer, insist that as a preliminary to divorce proceedings a petitioner shall swear an affidavit that there is no collusion with the other side. In those affidavits as much perjury is committed as is committed in the witness-box. When the time comes for Parliament to give us the long overdue revision of our laws of marriage and divorce we may hope that there will be an enquiry into the wisdom of such affidavits. If our marriage and divorce laws could be re-modelled, there might be no need for preliminary oaths that there is no collusion and there would also be far less false evidence when the cases are heard.

But the crux of the matter lies in civil actions. Here, while there is a conflict of judicial testimony as to the gravity of the problem, it cannot be denied that a serious problem confronts it. We must not make the mistake of assuming that every conflict of evidence necessarily means perjury on one side or the other. Very often the explanation lies in self-hypnotism, in unconscious bias due to sympathy, or in an inability to realise what has been seen or heard. The average man or woman who is present at the scene of a traffic accident, for instance, is inherently incapable of being an accurate witness. If he was in one of the vehicles, the probability is that his indignation at having been put in danger induces hostility to those responsible for the other vehicle. If he was on the pavement, the probability is that he was taking no notice until the noise of the collision attracted him, but he is not likely to realise the fact. Some years ago I was on the front seat of the top of an omnibus which became involved in an accident in Pall Mall. I was getting off in any case at the Crimea Statue, so, seeing that nobody was hurt and very little harm done, I went my way. A few minutes later I had an opportunity of writing, so I practised on myself and tried to write down a true account of what I had seen. A car had somehow come from about the Carlton Hotel entrance and another car had been stationary opposite the offices of Brown,

Shipley & Co. My eyes had been directed upon the whole scene, but my mind had been elsewhere. Cross-examining myself, I found that I could not write down anything of any value. But had I been questioned on the spot, I might well have made statements which in fact were not true; I should certainly have put the blame on the moving car and not on the omnibus driver, and yet on reflection I knew that I was totally incapable of giving any evidence at all. But making all allowance for self-hypnotism and unconscious bias, the unpleasant fact remains that even in our civil cases there is a considerable volume of deliberate perjury.

The function of our civil courts is to do all that is humanly possible to encourage truth in witnesses and to discourage untrue or partisan evidence. To what extent do we attain this? In his address Mr Justice McCardie touched upon one point in this connection that deserves more attention than it has received. 'He had more than once,' he said, 'put to himself the question: "Does the fulfilment of a barrister's functions as an advocate tend to implant a false standard or conception in the mind of the average witness present in court and watching with eager interest the conduct of a case by counsel?"' The answer must be "Yes." The learned judge was referring only to the danger that witnesses may be influenced by the way in which counsel in court put forward their cases. This danger is very real, and it opens up considerations that go to the root of our present methods of civil trial. The problem of perjury in civil litigation cannot be understood without reference to certain prominent features of our English system, namely our methods of presenting cases to the court and of calling and cross-examining witnesses.

In his book 'The Expansion of the Common Law,' Sir Frederick Pollock wrote that 'our native common law procedure is in essence contentious; it is a combat between parties in which the court is only umpire.' This feature of our civil actions is due to the fact that English legal procedure has always assumed that civil actions have to be tried like criminal cases; in both trial by jury has been the traditional method and in both one side has to discharge the burden of proving its case before the other side is called upon to answer it. Each witness

is carefully examined by the counsel who calls him and every effort is made to prevent his doing more than answer questions; both sides are bound by what is said by the witnesses whom they call. These characteristics are, as I have shown in my recent book,* peculiar to the English system and, so far as criminal trials are concerned, no one would seriously doubt their wisdom. In this country we should never tolerate the method under which a criminal trial became merely an investigation into the truth, in which the most important feature would probably be the rigorous and compulsory examination of the accused person. Our method of compelling the Crown to prove its case against the prisoner before the prisoner need answer may result in wholesale acquittals of the guilty, but it practically never condemns the innocent. But are such principles the best for conducting civil actions? This is a question which I have been bold enough to ask, but not to answer finally, in my 'In Quest of Justice.'

When we examine into the inevitable results of this method of conducting civil trials we at once see how greatly our system increases the chances of perjury. With us witnesses are brought to court and are called by the parties. Thus, when Smith thinks that he has a claim against Brown, Smith's lawyers, knowing that Smith must prove his case before Brown gets near the witness-box, collect all the evidence that they can. Brown's lawyers are at the same time busy with witnesses—sometimes the same witnesses as Smith is thinking of calling—and gradually both cases are built up. By the time that the case is ready for trial every witness thus tends to be a partisan. I can best illustrate the danger to truth that this involves by repeating a wicked, and doubtless apocryphal, story. A barrister was about to conduct a case in the County Court, in which his client, the plaintiff, was claiming damages because he had fallen off an omnibus. The cost of preparing the case had been heavy and the plaintiff would have no prospects of paying his lawyer's bill unless he received substantial damages in the case. Just before the case came on the barrister paraded his witnesses and said, 'Do you all know what perjury means?'

* 'In Quest of Justice.' John Murray, 1931.

The answer being in the negative, the barrister explained :
' If you don't all say what's in your proofs, that's perjury.'

Happily, it often happens that those who have been willing to assent to the giving of false evidence refuse to do so when the responsible time comes. Over and over again I have heard both parties and witnesses in civil litigation tell the truth in the witness-box in marked contrast to the statements they had made before the hearing. Those who urge the abolition of oaths in court can know little of humanity as it reveals itself in our courts of law. People may be influenced by improper considerations when they tell their stories to lawyers ; lawyers may convince them that the story that best fits the case is the true story ; but it often happens that the truth comes out voluntarily in the witness-box. Plenty of cases are lost because the human readiness to lie fails when confronted with the dignity of our courts of law and the ceremony of swearing upon the Bible.

When Herr Schmidt wants to sue Herr Braun, his lawyer explains his whole case to the court in writing. A German lawyer of standing would only in exceptional cases get into touch with any witness. Herr Schmidt would tell his lawyer that Herr Zeuge knows something useful about the case, and accordingly the lawyer would record in his written case that on such and such points Herr Zeuge is available. Herr Braun's lawyers have meanwhile been doing the same, and in their case Fräulein Zeugin will be referred to. But neither side will be bound by what is said by a witness he has nominated. The court then considers the written cases, often without any lawyer being present, and the court decides whether Herr Zeuge or Fräulein Zeugin will or will not assist its understanding of the case. If such evidence is desired, the court summons Herr Zeuge or Fräulein Zeugin or both, and often hears them in the absence of any representative of the parties. The essence of their evidence is recorded by the judge and is placed among the papers to be considered by the trial judge. The witnesses do not ordinarily attend the hearing of the case.

Under our modern system, though affidavit evidence is allowed in certain classes of cases, the ordinary practice is that every point essential to the proof of the case, even points that cannot really be disputed, have to be proved

by oral evidence. What happens with us when the witness arrives in court and gives his evidence? Just because we regard a civil trial as a combat, we conduct it on the assumption that perjury may be committed. The latitude allowed to English barristers to cross-examine not only the parties but also their witnesses and the practice of allowing any witness to be 'cross-examined to credit' (meaning an attempt to show that because of some past and usually irrelevant incident in the witness's life the evidence that he has just given should not be believed), both 'tend to implant a false standard,' to use again Mr Justice McCardie's words. Cross-examining counsel regard it as a normal part of the day's work, especially in jury cases, to suggest that a witness is lying. Usually the suggestion is unjustified, as discrepancies and inaccuracies in evidence are capable of a simple explanation and seldom show deliberate lying. But the very fact that counsel are engaged in a combat makes them exaggerate the discrepancies and makes them somewhat reckless in their suggestions of perjury. In fact our system of civil trial assumes bias, or at least the possibility of bias, in every witness. Our system works on somewhat the same methods as our General Elections; all parties exaggerate and lie as they please, and we hope that somehow or other the somewhat bewildered recipient of these contradictory persuasions will arrive at the truth. All this will sound very natural to an English lawyer. But it is well to realise, when we are reflecting on complaints that perjury is rife in our courts, that our methods are totally different from those of most other countries. When Herr Zeuge and Fräulein Zeugin arrive in their German court they tell their stories freely and only the judge interrupts them. At the end of their statement, of which the judge records the essence only, the lawyers (if they are present, which is frequently not the case) may suggest additional questions to the judge. To 'lead' a witness as we do, or to cross-examine him directly, is never allowed.

Such a system will doubtless make an English lawyer shiver. I have explained it at much greater length in my book. But for our present purposes the vital question is whether the English or the German method is the more likely to elicit the truth and avoid perjury. The German system assumes truth in witnesses and gives no

inducement to lying. The witnesses are called by the court to assist the court, and have little inducement to give false evidence. The English system, on the other hand, apart from the risks inevitably involved in the permitting of interested parties to give sworn evidence, must obviously involve greater possibilities of false evidence. I recently asked a German judge who knows a great deal about our English methods whether in his opinion perjury in German civil proceedings was a serious problem. He unhesitatingly said 'No.' The cases in which the judges—upon whom rather than upon the lawyers falls the burden of checking false evidence—in Germany fail to sift the evidence given are, he told me, 'not so numerous as to cause a real danger to justice.' He firmly believes that perjury is far worse in England than in Germany, and explained this by the fact that, as I have said, 'in England calling the witness means bringing him with you. This supposes that the witness must have sympathy for you and antipathy to your opponent. In Germany no litigant brings witnesses with him. The German system diminishes the contact between litigant and witness before the witness is heard.' The English lawyer would at once say that a judge cannot be as competent to detect and expose false evidence as cross-examining counsel who knows all the details of the case, and this objection to the German system cannot easily be disposed of. On the whole I am not convinced, however, that there is more risk of an unjust decision being given in Germany through successful perjury than there is with us.

One further point needs to be considered, namely, the abundance of oaths required by English legal procedure and the consequent tendency to regard sworn testimony as a mere formality. English lawyers who go for the first time to a German court of justice are always impressed by the solemnity of the ceremony when a witness takes an oath. Everybody in court usually rises and the judge personally administers the oath, having previously warned the witness of its meaning. With us the oath is administered by a clerk or an usher, is mumbled by the witness, and usually there is a rumble of subdued talk in court while it is being taken; nobody pays any attention to the ceremony. More than once I have read letters in

'The Times' from English lawyers who have just returned from a 'busman's holiday' in Germany and who comment upon this contrast. But such letters have never shown any understanding of the reason for the contrast. An oath is a comparatively rare event in German proceedings and is reserved for occasions when the court is satisfied that sworn testimony is desirable. We, on the other hand, demand, as a rule, that every fact necessary to build up a case shall be proved in open court by the oath of a witness. As I have tried to show in my book, the present oppressive cost of litigation is largely due to the strictness of our laws of evidence which necessitate the bringing of numerous witnesses, whose evidence in other systems would be taken for granted. Of each witness an oath is demanded. Again we demand innumerable oaths as part of the preliminary procedure of a case. I have already referred to the rule that demands of a petitioner for divorce an oath that he has not been in collusion with the other party to the suit. But in everyday civil cases we demand many oaths from litigants. Thus if A claims the return of £150 which he lent to B, A has to swear that 'in his belief there is no defence to the action,' if he wants the quick debt-collecting procedure of our courts to operate. The fact that in the majority of such cases the defendants are given leave to defend the action shows the value to be placed upon such oaths by the plaintiff and how little our system is shocked by exaggeration or untruth in affidavits. I have often wondered whether we should not attain a higher standard of truthfulness if our rules of procedure ceased to exact oaths in mere matters of ordinary procedure. We even exact oaths from litigants in what are called 'affidavits of documents'; thus A's solicitor's clerk makes out an elaborate list of A's documents (the longer it is the more the solicitor is paid; such is our method for remunerating a great profession) and in a big case it must be very rare that A can even understand it. But A has to swear that it is correct. Surely there are other and simpler methods for securing that parties shall not keep back essential and relevant documents. This clumsy and conscience-tempting procedure is not used in our Commercial Court, which is our nearest approach to practical, quick, and inexpensive justice.

No practical man would suggest that we should or could adopt the German system. But in this country legal reform is in the air. The terrible cost of litigation with us is compelling both the public and the legal profession to investigate our system and even some of the basic principles upon which it rests. In a chapter of my book to which I gave the somewhat frivolous title of 'What the Soldier Said,' I have suggested that in the simplification of our laws of evidence lies one method of securing cheaper justice. Once our laws of evidence are scrutinised by competent hands, as I believe they may well be before long, we may hope that they will be examined also from the standpoint of inducements to perjury. Those upon whom will fall the burden of examining our present methods of civil trial might well consider whether it is possible to distinguish such methods more definitely from our methods of criminal prosecutions. It may be possible to get away from the whole idea that civil trials are combats and to organise them as enquiries into the truth. In a non-technical journal I obviously cannot enter into details about reforms that might be possible, but if we could revise some of our fundamental methods for preparing and hearing civil disputes, I am convinced that we should go far to solve both the pressing problem of the excessive cost of litigation and the almost equally pressing problem of perjury.

CLAUD MULLINS.

Art. 3.—SEA MONSTERS.

1. *The Natural History of Norway*. By Bishop Pontopidan. 1748.
2. *The Great Sea Serpent, an Historical Critical Treatise*. By A. C. Oudemans. Luzac, 1892.
3. *The Case for the Sea Serpent*. By Lieut.-Commander R. T. Gould, R.N. Philip Allan, 1930.
4. *Battles with Giant Fish*. By F. A. Mitchell Hedges. Duckworth, 1924.
5. *The Mystery and Lore of Monsters*. By C. J. S. Thompson. 1930.
6. *The Principle Navigators, Voyages, etc., of the English Nation*. By Richard Hakluyt. In Eight Volumes. Dent, 1927.

WHEN a certain Colonel T. H. Perkins, of Boston, U.S.A., was asked by Sir Charles Lyell, whether he had heard of the sea-serpent—the one no doubt that was seen many times by hundreds of people off that coast about 1817—he replied, ‘Unfortunately I have seen it.’ And that first word tells a tale. Owing to the stupid ridicule with which reports of the appearance of what are generally known as ‘Sea-Serpents’ are almost always received, even by so-called scientific people, observers are afraid to record unusual appearances at sea. A favourite device of the sceptics is to label all the various monsters seen as *The Sea-Serpent* or *The Great Sea-Serpent*, as if there were or could be only one, a mythical monster, like the Flying Dutchman, ranging the seas and occasionally sighted by credulous or imbecile persons, who do not know ‘a hawk from a handsaw.’

To take a well-known instance: Captain Drewar of the barque ‘*Pauline*’ was fortunate enough, on July 8, 1875, to see an especially large sperm whale (and some of the males of this species have a head as big as a Pullman car, and reach the length of 98 feet) in deadly combat with a veritable serpent, for it was twice coiled round the whale, its head and tail both being visible, the former held high in air with the mouth open, the serpent being evidently in agony. The creature was 8 or 9 feet in girth, and the tail and head, as seen, were 30 feet in length. The struggle continued for a quarter of an hour, the

serpent attempting to free itself by boa-constricting the whale which, no doubt, had seized it in its capacious jaws. At last the whale plunged down carrying the serpent with it. Five days later the same or a similar creature was seen to raise its head and neck 60 feet out of the sea. When the Captain described what he had seen, some of his friends said they would have held their tongues, if they had seen 100 sea-serpents, for fear of losing their character for sanity and truthfulness. Even an Admiral in his book, 'My Life and a Few Yarns,' deliberately suppressed a personal experience of this kind, when in command of H.M.S. 'Tartar' about 1892, owing to the general attitude of the public towards such yarns. Another ship's-captain frankly owned that, when being below decks a sea-serpent was reported to him as sighted, he refused to go on deck to see it lest, if he had to admit that he had seen such a sight, he should be branded as a liar.

All this incredulity of self-conceit is utterly unscientific and obstructs the progress of true knowledge. Let it then be said emphatically now and here, that to a mind that is ready to learn, there is no reason whatever to doubt the occasional, and by no means infrequent, appearance not only in the great oceans and in the smaller seas, but even in estuaries, lochs, and fiords, of huge marine monsters unknown to science and unclassified. There are literally hundreds of authentic instances, and these unusual and enormous creatures have been seen by thousands of observers from ship-board and from shore, by passengers and crews, officers of the Royal Navy and the Merchant Service, local inhabitants, and fisher-folk, not to say naturalists and scientists. It would be futile and absurd in the highest degree to suppose that intelligent, truthful, experienced, and in every way competent, observers have never seen what they affirm, in many cases with an affidavit attached, that they have seen; but that they were in every case deceived—heaven save the mark!—by a row of porpoises (though not a single dorsal fin might be visible), or by a flight of birds skimming over the sea (but how could they keep their formation so exactly and for so long?), or by a floating log (but what a tree, perhaps 200 feet long!), or by a huge mass of seaweed, which could only in its bobbing motion simulate life, but could never act like a living

creature (how, for instance, could a baulk of timber or matted seaweed travel at a mile a minute or even 3 miles an hour?). These indeed are ridiculous suppositions, however solemnly enunciated by the unco' wise. That such commonplace phenomena have occasionally deceived the eye for a short time is, of course, possible, and in fact proved to have occurred; but that the hundreds of circumstantial reports, and the illustrations made at the time by a score of observers, can be explained on these or any similar hypotheses, is not worth a moment's consideration.

But it will be possible, in any article of admissible length, merely to summarise the overwhelming mass of available evidence for the existence of the various monsters of the sea recorded in the last 400 years. It is absurd for people who have not studied this evidence to argue, for purposes of ridicule, as if only one creature, and that a serpent, has been on every supposed occasion observed and recorded. In reality, comparatively few of the observations necessitate the assumption that it was a true serpent that was seen, such as was the case in Captain Drewar's report, given above. But there are enough to show that marine snakes do exist of stupendous length and girth. As sea-snakes of ordinary size are a recognised genus, there is nothing in the nature of things to make the existence of very much larger ones impossible. In fact the evidence shows that they do exist.

We should naturally have expected to find mention of strange sea beasts in the voyages over virgin and unknown oceans, so vividly recorded in Hakluyt, but there appear to be only one or two such described by these voyagers. The principal account occurs in the voyage of Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1583 to Florida, in which Raleigh was a sharer, when they had determined to sail home again :

'So upon Saturday in the afternoone the 31 of August, we changed our course and returned back for England, at which very instant, even in winding about, there passed along betweene us and towards the land which we now forsooke a very lion to our seeming, in shape, hair, and colour, not swimming after the manner of a beast, by moving of his feete, but rather sliding upon the water, with his whole body (excepting legs) in sight, neither yet diving under, and again rising above the water, as the maner is of Whales, Dolphins, Tunise, Porposes, and all other fish; but confidently shewing

himselfe above water without hiding ; notwithstanding we presented ourselves in open view and gesture to amaze him, as all creatures will be commonly at a sudden gaze and sight of man. Thus he passed along turning his head to and fro, yawning, and gaping wide, with ougly demonstration of long teeth and glaring eies, and to bidde us a farewell (coming right against the Hinde) he sent forth a horrible voyce, roaring or bellowing as doth a lion, which spectacle wee all beheld as farre as we were able to discerne the same, as men prove to wonder at every strange thing, as this doubtlesse was, to sea (*sic*) a lion in the Ocean Sea, or fish in the shape of a lion. What opinion others had thereof, and chiefly the generall himselfe, I forbear to deliver : but he tooke it for Bonum Omen, rejoicing that he was to warre against such an enemie, if it were the devill.'

This monster was evidently a large specimen of the Pinniped tribe, of which our ordinary Sea Lion is a member. The other narration is found in the account of a voyage set out by the Earl of Cumberland in 1586 for the South Sea in the 'Red Dragon' and the bark 'Clifford' under Captain Withrington and Christopher Lister. The incident took place off Sierra Leone on Oct. 23, 1586 :

'Then wee returned to our boates, and tooke wood and water at our pleasure, and reasonable store of fish, and amongst the rest we halled a great foule monster, whose head and backe were so hard, that no sword could enter it ; but being thrust in under the belly in divers places, and much wounded, he bowed (? bent) a sword in his mouth, as a man would do a girdle of leather about his hande, and likewise the iron of a boare speare. He was in length about nine foote, and had nothing in his belly, but a certaine quantitie of small stones to the value of a pottell.'

A queer fish indeed !

By far the greater number of recorded and authentic testimonies relate to creatures different from the serpent tribe. From the various descriptions given of them, they obviously belong to more than one species of animal. We are told sometimes that the head is round or bullet-shaped, at others that it is long and pointed, sometimes that it resembles the head of a turtle, occasionally even that of an alligator or crocodile or a horse. The picture, which illustrates one of the most famous of all the records,

namely that of the creature seen so close by the officers of H.M.S. 'Daedalus' in 1849, shows a head much like a seal's, at all events the head of a mammal, of an animal, that is, which breathes with lungs, not as a fish with gills. Such an animal must, like the whale, come up to the surface to breathe. On the other hand, other sea monsters reported seem to have been true fishes, though it is not easy to classify them. In all these cases it is the immense size, which constitutes the great difficulty in their identification, and at the same time affords the clearest proof that we have to do with some unknown species of animal. The largest known animal of our day does not exceed 105 feet in length; but these monsters are seldom less than 100 feet and often reach to 250 or even 300 feet. This is not due to any optical illusion or delusion. Witness after witness testifies to these measurements; not as a result of mere guesswork, but by comparison with ships and other well-known objects. We may be certain that 150 feet is quite a common length. One peculiarity noted time after time is, that these monsters move through the water—often at a very great pace, anything that is up to a mile a minute—with head and neck sometimes as much as twenty or thirty feet or even more above water.

One phenomenon was witnessed by Dr Farquhar Matheson and his wife between Skye and the mainland in September 1893 at midday on a calm day. It may be noted here that hot weather and a calm sea are favourable for such appearances. Suddenly about 200 yards off their boat rose up from the water 'a long straight snake-like thing, as tall as the mast of the yacht.' It is described as having been much like the head and neck of a giraffe, but with the head attached to the neck at a different angle, and not at right angles. The skin was smooth and not scaly. Though the body was, apparently, not fully seen, the creature was likened to a gigantic lizard. This startling apparition was visible more than once. The mention of a lizard in this connexion will recall the theory advanced by some naturalists, that the small head and long tapering neck and tail with a bulky body, attributed to many of the creatures reported, remind us of such prehistoric fish-lizards as the Plesiosaurus, Mososaurus, and Basilosaurus, which roamed the Mesozoic seas, and are known now only by their skeletons. But it is highly

improbable that, without any similar species appearing in the Tertiary epoch, they could have won through to our own times. Still there are such survivals with long gaps in the evidence of their existence, such as the hideous chimæra, which nondescript creature has been supposed, in an unusually huge form, to account for one or two of the 'sea-serpents' recorded. The ancient Chimæra was, of course, a fabulous animal, as much so as the heraldic Wyvern. Yet a vice-admiral of the Fleet, commanding H.M.S. 'Cæsar' in 1920, saw between Ireland and the Isle of Man a creature, not bigger, however, than a Chow dog, leap 40 feet out of the water close to his ship, and when a little later he saw a Wyvern on the arms of Rye he recognised in it a close resemblance to his weird fish.

Some of the characteristics of the so-called Sea-Serpents have been already incidentally mentioned. Others, which occur repeatedly in the accounts, are the presence of one or two sets of flappers or side fins; a mane on the neck, no doubt of male specimens; motion by vertical undulations, like a leech or caterpillar, not laterally as with a swimming snake; a series of humps or bunches along the back when the body is partially submerged, which may be due to undulatory motion; great speed in swimming, whether the method of propulsion was by means of the flapper or by a drive of the tail. A dive head foremost like a duck has been observed, but often the creature will sink like a stone without any splash. Though the neck is generally described as long and tapering, it is sometimes thick and short, as in the 'Dædalus' sketch. The body measurement is occasionally given as 20 feet across; but usually it is said to be as big as a barrel or the ship's boom. The head is not generally spoken of as fearsome to look at, though it is so sometimes, as in the report made by Captain Bartlett of the S.S. 'Trisco' of a sea-serpent seen off Cape Hatteras on May 30, 1903. But it cannot be said that we feel implicit confidence in this particular narrative. The animal was 100 feet long, and 20 feet round behind the shoulders. It had humps. The head was 5 feet long and 'unspeakably loathsome,' with a neck 18 inches in diameter. Under the jaw was a sort of pouch of skin. In general shape the head was rather pointed, but blunt at the end, and upturned like a snout, with a projecting

lower jaw. The teeth of such monsters have seldom been observed, but in this case we are told that at the back of the mouth were seen two large molars, curving down and back, like walrus tusks about 18 inches long. The mouth was red, and the almond-shaped eyes, placed vertically, 7 inches by 4, had a reddish glare. The most horrible feature of all was a great webbed crest, which shot up suddenly above the head, supported by a sharp pointed spine. But the account seems too precise and definite in its particulars, while important details as to distance and time are omitted. To believe such a tale requires all the assurances available. Something similar in the way of appurtenances to the head is, however, attributed to a long, thin, flexible serpentine creature seen by Captain Laurence Thomson of the liner 'Nemesis' on Oct. 25, 1900, off the coast of Western Australia, behind the head of which rose a membrane, like a fin or flap, which bent itself canopy-fashion over the head, and then took an upright position. Once or twice these monsters have been seen to blow like whales, and once heard to snort, and once again to have a strong disagreeable smell. In general, they are silent, timid, and harmless, though on the Norwegian Coasts, where they were often seen, they have been credited with attacking fishing-boats.

A great point is made by disbelievers of the fact, that no single specimen of the 'Sea-Serpent' has been brought to hand. But in 1808 a most strange beast was washed ashore at Stronza in the Orkneys, which, if the rude drawing made at the time is any criterion, was like no known animal. It was carefully measured, and was 55 feet in length, with a longish neck, tapering tail, three pairs of fins, and a row of spines from shoulder to tail. Unfortunately when found it was in a decomposed state, and only a few vertebræ and a part of the skull were saved. These were pronounced to be those of a basking shark! But the latter is a well-known fish, and the drawing has no resemblance whatever to it. Moreover, who ever saw a basking shark of anything like 55 feet in length with a tapering tail? * Another 'Sea-Serpent' was

* Curiously enough, Colonel John Murray tells me that he possesses a small portion of this monster. Joanna Baillie sent Lady Byron, to give to the Poet, in 1815, a portion of the bone and bristle of this actual snake, which has been preserved with Joanna's own letter.

seen floating on the sea, dead, close to his ship by Captain Rathbone of the S.S. 'Tropper,' belonging to Fisher, Renwick & Co., off Dungeness on Mar. 20, 1906. It resembled a huge conger eel, but was 50 feet long and 3 feet in girth. Its skin was streaked with long white lines and it was seen to have two small ears. Another dead sea-monster, 190 feet long, was seen by the Captain of the brig 'Wilson,' in June 1818, off Cape Henry. It had a mouth and head of enormous size. At first it was taken for a floating wreck, but a boat was lowered and rowed to it, and it was found to be an unknown animal. It is not easy to explain why neither of these worthy Captains thought it worth while to take the carcasses on board, or at all events make a thorough and detailed examination of their finds. It is deplorable that two such chances were missed. On more than one occasion sea-serpents have been fired at, and once the creature was certainly hit, but with no other effect than to alarm or enrage it. But had it been killed, it would probably have sunk. Another was harpooned by a Captain Rich in this same year 1818, but after an exciting though brief chase the harpoon came away. This is vouched for by the Report of a Committee at Boston, U.S.A., and we must perforce accept it as true. With these examples before us we cannot but hope that at some time an actual specimen of at least one of the species of 'sea-serpents' will be brought to land, and the question of its identity settled.

The Dutch Professor A. C. Oudemans has written, in our language, a large octavo book of 600 pages, transcribing over 160 reports and papers on the subject of the sea-serpent, with an appendix noting nearly fifty more appearances, the whole work covering four centuries, from 1500 to 1900. No doubt he has missed some, and there must have been a proportionate number of reports since. He discusses the various hypotheses, and subjects them to a careful analysis, summarising the whole evidence. He comes to the conclusion that some sort of gigantic Pinniped, of the seal tribe, best explains the recorded facts; but it is only a proportion of the whole appearances that accord with such explanation. He proves the reality of these appearances of sea-monsters; but they must be classified under several types or cate-

gories, viz. those of (1) Serpents proper, (2) Congers, (3) Seals, (4) Fish Lizards, and possibly (5) Ribbon or Tape fish—all on a giant scale; for the staggering feature of nearly all the accounts is the enormous size attributed to the creatures seen. Some, without doubt, were air-breathing mammals, like whales; others were fishes, others serpents, or of the lizard kind.

The sea is so wide and deep that sea animals are on record which have only been seen once, or it may be twice, and perhaps have never been captured. Such are the Toothless Whale of Havre, of which only one specimen has been known, though found in a sea which washes our own shores. A whole school of whales, some 30 feet long, were seen for 17 hours continuously by the naturalist Goose on his way to the West Indies, and affirmed by him to belong to no known species, and they have never been seen again, though, as mammals, they must often come to the surface to breathe. Mr. Mitchell Hedges' book, 'Battles with Big Fish,' has opened our eyes to the unsuspected size that can be attained by such familiar fish as the Shark, Sawfish, and Sting-Ray. When we consider the enormous depths and vast extent of the great seas of our planet, and that the element in which marine creatures live has never suffered the vicissitudes of temperature and catastrophic cataclysms such as have affected the land, we can well believe that Nature has there had a freer hand to originate and perpetuate monsters. The true scientific attitude to take up is that there is nothing impossible *per se* in these recorded observances; that we have no right to doubt the evidence of such and so many qualified witnesses, because we ourselves have not seen anything of the kind. Several sceptics have been converted by themselves seeing what they had ridiculed as impossible when seen by others. But what is the intellectual credit of believing only what you see yourself? How does that in itself make the fact more certain?

It remains now to give one or two reports out of the many available. The first to be quoted is short, but the well-known naturalist, Edward Newman, editor of the 'Zoologist,' in the middle of the nineteenth century, said that it was the most important fact in Natural History recorded during that century, so far as it had gone. In the year 1848, Captain the Hon. George Hope of H.M.S.

'Fly,' cruising in the Gulf of California, when the sea was calm and transparent, saw at the bottom, pursuing its prey, a huge marine animal—unfortunately he gives no estimate of its exact size—with the head and general shape of an alligator, except that the head was much longer, and the creature had four large flappers in lieu of legs, the front pair being the larger. It moved somewhat in a serpentine manner, showing an appearance of ring-like divisions in its body. It seems from his account to have borne some resemblance to the Fish-Lizards mentioned above, of which he had apparently never heard. Now in this case there was no question of optical illusion, the favourite explanations of porpoises, seaweed, tree-trunk, or flights of birds being of course out of court.

Our next shall be an incident which created more than usual interest owing to the character of the witnesses. A scientific expedition, sailing under the ægis of Lord Crawford in the 'Valhalla,' during 1906, to collect specimens for the British Museum, were presented with an unique opportunity, unfortunately beyond their power to utilise, of 'collecting' a Sea-serpent. Two scientific naturalists, Messrs. Meade-Waldo and Nicoll, on board in an official capacity, were fortunate enough to see, while at about a hundred yards away off the coast of Brazil, a large fin (as it appeared to be) with a serrated edge, like a frill, shew itself about 2 feet above the water, while beneath the surface a big creature could be discerned. Soon a great head, resembling that of a turtle, and neck to match, rose 7 or 8 feet above the sea. The neck was as thick as a man's thigh or a slim man's waist. The creature was seen again the next day by others of the crew, and perhaps later on by Lady Augusta Fane. For she related in her book, 'Chitchat,' published twenty years later, that, sailing with her son George near Halifax in a 22-foot boat of his own design with a centrebeam, they suddenly heard a rushing sound approaching them, and looking back saw to their astonishment, within a few yards, a 'Sea-serpent' forging its way through the sea. It had a flat head raised about 4 feet above the water. Its body, quite 150 feet long, was a little less than a foot across, and it had a skin like a python with dark brown patches. It appeared to have no fins, and seemed to propel itself by the strength of its back, wriggling

through the water like a snake moving in pursuit of its prey. Lady Augusta adds that they heard later of what had been seen by the crew of the 'Valhalla,' and makes the conjecture that both parties had seen the same animal. But the creature observed by Messrs. Meade-Waldo and Nicioll had a fin and this had not, so far as could be seen.

Space will allow of the mention of but one other, that, namely, which rests upon the authority of the officers of the Royal Yacht 'Osborne.' On June 2, 1877, when off Cape Vito in Sicily, they saw about 200 yards away a huge monster, estimated to be 150 feet long, of which Lieutenant Haynes made a sketch. This shows its bullet-shaped head and broad back—between 15 and 20 feet across—from behind, with two great flappers, 15 feet long, one on each side, revolving like paddle-wheels, by which it propelled itself at the rate of more than four knots an hour. It swam like a turtle, but its head with a breadth of 6 feet looked from behind like a seal's, and the only officer who saw its features says they resembled those of an alligator. It apparently had no scales. Obviously it was no familiar animal, for who ever heard of a turtle or seal 150 feet long?

So much for these observations. There are scores of a similar kind, reported from almost every ocean and sea-coast. The most favourite localities for the appearance of 'Sea-serpents' are Norway and the Eastern Coast of America. Not a fisherman on the coast of Norway has the smallest doubt as to the existence of these marine monsters, and the incredulity of foreigners is incomprehensible to them. There was another huge creature of which the Norwegians affirmed the existence, the Kraken, which was similarly called in question by the sceptics. But it has been proved now that the natives were right, and the Kraken is found to be a gigantic calamary or octopus, such as Victor Hugo describes in 'Les Misérables.' Enormous specimens—40 feet in girth and 30 to 50 feet in length, with tentacles more than 50 feet long—have been washed ashore. The Norwegian sea-serpents are no more fabulous than the Norwegian Krakens. In the second decade of the nineteenth century monsters were seen time after time off the coasts of Massachusetts. The Atlantic Ocean has been more prolific of observations

than the Pacific and Indian Oceans, but only because more traversed. All the western coasts of Europe furnish their quotas, especially the N.W. Coast of Scotland. The Eastern Coasts of our island have not been equally fortunate, but in 1912 several observers at different points and times round about Yarmouth and southwards as far as Rye and Bexhill reported a 'sea-serpent,' according to one record 60 feet long, which swam at the rate of a mile a minute.

The mass of evidence requires to be skilfully resifted, and in particular the sketches made by observers, which are scattered about in all sorts of publications, collected and compared, before we can form any conclusive opinion as to the nature of the various animals comprehended under the one generic name of Sea-serpents. Even on land animals of huge size may exist, which have never been captured or classified. It is only quite lately that the Okapi, a zebra-like horse of some size, long known to the natives, has been proved to exist, and has made its appearance in our Museums. From the discovery of the skin of a Giant Sloth or *Mylodon* in a cave of Patagonia, at the beginning of this century, it has been supposed that this creature of prehistoric days may still linger on. The existence of the hairy-eared two-horned Rhinoceros rests upon a single specimen secured at Chittagong in 1868. The Dragon Lizard of Java, which has always been known to its inhabitants, has only lately been brought to the knowledge of the world, and is already in danger of extinction. Another Giant Lizard of Zululand seen by the hunters of King Lewanika was described in an official report to the British resident as making a track as wide as a full-sized trek-wagon and being ten times the size of a crocodile. In the swamps of the Upper Nile a gigantic brown and yellow snake 40-100 feet long, called the Lau, has been seen, it is averred, even by European hunters. The footprints of a creature in Kenya Colony, called by the natives Chimiset, showing three toes, prove the existence of an unknown animal of large size, as to the existence of which even the late F. C. Selous was not quite sceptical. Another mysterious creature, the *Nipumasimba*, with most curious footprints, partly like those of man and partly like those of a lion, has been hunted in Tanganyika. It preys on cattle, dogs, and

children. There are also, waiting to be caught in Africa, a huge ape and a gigantic cat, both unknown to Science; and in Java and Tibet creatures with native names, that walk upright yet are not men, hairy as bears. But these animals rest for their existence on native hearsay. Let us conclude with two uncontrovertible facts. In November, 1921, off Cape May, a great creature was washed ashore. It was a mammal weighing 15 tons and as large as five fully-grown elephants. None of the scientists who saw it could identify it with any known creature. Photographs showed that it resembled an elephant in some ways, and could best be described, says Mr. Mitchell Hedges, as a Sea Elephant of colossal proportions. The other fact is the lately demonstrated existence in Africa of a pigmy race of men, mentioned by the ancients, but not previously verified. All this being so, what *a priori* difficulty can there be to believing that the Marine Monsters so often seen by many observers, and in numerous instances sketched, are real creatures? But not until one is actually brought home, exhibited, and dissected will the matter be set finally at rest.

C. R. HAINES.

Art. 4.—THE REAL JOAN OF ARC.

1. *Jeanne D'Arc*. Par H. Wallon. Paris : Firmin-Didot, 1876.
2. *Jeanne D'Arc, Maid of Orleans, Deliverer of France, Being the Story of her Life, her Achievements, and her Death, as attested on Oath and Set Forth in the Original Documents*. Edited by T. Douglas Murray. Heinemann, 1902.
3. *Saint Joan : A Chronicle Play in Six Scenes and an Epilogue*. By Bernard Shaw. Constable, 1930.
4. *The Witch Cult in Western Europe. A Study in Anthropology*. By Margaret Alice Murray. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1921.

And other works.

THE 30th of May next will be the five-hundredth anniversary of the murder and the martyrdom of Joan of Arc, who, as all the world knows, was born in 1412 of simple peasants at Domrémy in the province of Lorraine ; and it is well to point the occasion. Although she has been much written of, over-written, made sometimes legendary, and in this so-called practical century actually has been canonised by the Church that helped to kill her, she remains a wonderfully human figure ; no mere stained-glass saint or sentimental religious shadow, but a living, breathing country-lass, who, out of the simplicities and inspirations of her life, arose in two brief years to save a prostrate realm, to crown a king who proved unworthy of his missionary, and to die a death in which the heroism was enhanced by the natural fears and shrinking weaknesses that proved her to be warmly human and cherishing life. Had it not been for the accidents or destiny which led her through great pathways to immortality, she would probably have lived a contented and unsung housewife and mother among the neighbours, sheep, and fairies of her native village. Her private inclinations, undoubtedly, in those ways went.

Fortunately, the twentieth century, which has bestowed on her a formal aureola—and no glory of spiritual beauty was added to her character and achievements through that painted ring of light—has brought closely home to readers in this country the realities of her individuality

and personal life, her amazing mission, and the dreadful ways through which she was brought to death. Three volumes that have helped to this effect are named at the head of this article. Mr T. Douglas Murray, in a work out-of-print that should be speedily reprinted, for it is of very great appeal and value, following Jules Quicherat, who ninety years ago brought to the light of publication the pigeon-holed documents that detailed the evidence of the Trial and the Enquiries before the Rehabilitation of Joan, shows clearly, out of the mouths of those who worked with her and knew her best, what she was, what she thought, and what she did. The whole of her moving and tremendous story is told in those pages with the enlightened sobriety of measured truth. Mr Bernard Shaw, in the second of these works, his 'Saint Joan,' not only for the first time has put on the stage a woman of selfless ideals, good heart, and sympathy, but has added to the body of English dramatic literature the best Chronicle Play since Shakespeare. Happily he was saved by the length and fullness of his theme from allowing it to degenerate to the chaff and barbed nonsense which have made many of his works so amusing and after a point often so dull. In the earlier scenes of this play he only narrowly escaped the fault of forgetting his dramatic purpose while poking fun at the treasured weaknesses, characteristics, and institutions of Englishmen; but, fortunately, time did not permit of further fritterings, and to confine the great tragedy within the compass of a normal dramatic opportunity meant economy of words; and so it is that his ever-rational 'Saint Joan' avoids the mere talkativeness that has marred many a Shavian utterance, and proves an outstanding play.

Finally, and very seriously, we have Miss Margaret Murray's study of 'The Witch Cult of Western Europe' with its particular applications to the Maid. Those who desire to understand the real Joan, the living woman unclouded by ecclesiastical light, are bound to consider the arguments raised in this challenging work. After thought, we are not disposed fully to accept Miss Murray's positive assertion that Joan 'was put to death as a witch, and the conduct of her associates during her military career, as well as the evidence at her trial, bear out the fact that she belonged to the ancient religion, not to the

Christian.' We are, however, convinced that, in the words of the credulous over any tall story, 'there is something in it'; and, indeed, there is much in it. We see Joan as holding faith, not only in the truths of religion as taught by the Church, but also in the old uncontrollable pagan beliefs—an indefinite though inevitable inheritance to most of us and especially to her in her medieval day—with their terrors and crude superstitions, including the midnight tyrannies of the 'little people.' At one and the same time, therefore, we may safely presume that she belonged to the ancient religion and to the Christian. To this important aspect of Joan we shall return.

However much the influences represented by demons and angels respectively contributed to her spiritual equipment, the wonder of her brief earthly career outmarks all else. It warms and thrills the heart to think of that unlettered girl of seventeen setting out to fulfil, and at the age of nineteen having fulfilled and sealed with her death, the far-seeing and sublime patriotic purpose that had risen from her dreams. It was not the case of youth acting upon impulse, for the thought of it had been with her for years; and many times, through various channels, she had endeavoured to set out on her God-appointed enterprise, but was repeatedly frustrated and admonished, even with threats of a beating and a ducking, by her father and the Sieur Robert de Baudricourt, the latter of whom, however, yielded to her insistence and enabled her to ride with an escort to the King. Nor was it an instance of a fool rushing in where angels feared to tread; for in her case, and faith, the angels were outspokenly urging her on with it, while assuredly she was no fool. All kinds of men and women in the evidence that procured her Rehabilitation testified to her exceptional intelligence in many very different ways of action and thought; while during her Trial, although she sat alone and was persistently harassed, without a friend in court to help her and no one permitted to defend her, facing her eager judges and their assessors, chosen scholars and casuists of the Church and the universities, cross-examined sometimes with crafty questions devised to entrap, she answered at all times wisely, prudently, often wittily, more than holding her own. Often when an earlier inquiry was repeated she successfully referred the questioner to the

answer already given, so that twice Manchon, one of the three registrars at the Trial, inscribed an admiring comment in the margin of his original manuscript, as 'Responsio Johannæ superba.'

As it was under the pressure of that relentless questioning, so also it was when she rode among the captains, a Chieftain of War—the expression applied to her which she definitely disclaimed. The Duke D'Alençon, an experienced and responsible soldier, with others, like the pleasantly notorious La Hire and Dunois, leaders of France, testified to her military skill. 'Every one wondered that she could act with as much wisdom and foresight as a captain who had fought for twenty or thirty years. It was above all in making use of artillery that she was so wonderful.' What are we to think of that expert testimony to the military gifts of a mere girl, who, until this adventure, had travelled hardly more than a league's distance from her pastoral village? Her strategy, military and political, in vision and common-sense was proved right. So long as the French acted according to her commands their cause flourished. The city of Orleans, her first objective, was relieved; its siege raised; and confidence was restored to her side, while that of the enemy was more than correspondingly weakened. So actual was her influence in war that the Burgundians and English, unable to ascribe her successes to normal soldiership, took her for a witch wielding powers of sorcery, and therefore in their ignorance and superstitions feared and hated her the more. The Dauphin was crowned King at Rheims; and then she should have returned home, as it is evident that she wished to do. But, as often, others, generally for selfish reasons, forbade and prevented; and the catastrophe fell. It is unnecessary to repeat the history, personal and national, of that little-glorious though extraordinary chapter of the Hundred Years' War. As with all such conflicts, the base, cruel, tawdry and ugly infinitely outweighed in the scales of historical truth the noble and the good. It is, therefore, the greater marvel that out of that sour and pitiful conflict so fine a spirit as Joan, a living Britomart, out-ranking any poet's heroine for courage, devotion, and beauty of heart and thought, should have arisen. It marks the truth of the inherent fineness of humanity and

bids us not to despair even when the social core of the world appears most rotten.

Possibly, though far from certainly, it was through treachery against her that the gates of Compiègne were closed on her after she had led a sortie against the besiegers, and, being cut off by men hidden in ambush while endeavouring to fight her way back to the town, was captured, dragged from her horse by a soldier who had seized her surcoat of cloth-of-gold. (So often in this way the mental picture is touched with some coloured vivid detail like that.) The rest was a slow, elaborate, and assured process of painful martyrdom. Sold by her Burgundian captors to the English for a fortune equal to some fifteen thousand pounds, with no efforts made by the French, from the King downwards, to re-purchase her or otherwise to secure her rescue or release—though Miss Murray has some possible explanation of that—she was kept under an unceasing, merciless surveillance. Closely imprisoned, heavily chained, sleeping in the same room as her common soldier guards, with not a woman near to companion her, the conditions she suffered of iron repression and loneliness were unspeakable, and so they continued for months. Her only safeguard—other than her amazing natural courage—was her man's dress, which, except for one brief relapse of weakness before the end, she refused successfully to give up. Without it, dressed as a woman among those coarse and ruthless men, what must her fate have been? As it is, the wonder remains that she passed out of that soul-wearing darkness of incarceration to the greater darkness and glory to come still a maid. Mr Bernard Shaw, who not for the only time then strains the evidence to make a point, asserts that, 'All the men who alluded to the matter declared most emphatically that she was unattractive sexually to a degree that seemed to them miraculous.' That is not so. The assertion in the face of the evidence is more than usually preposterous. She was, it is clear, as attractive as any other physically normal young woman in the bloom of life, and, no doubt, was conscious of the moral protection and self-confidence given among those rude companions by her masculine dress.

With no preparation for her case, with no one permitted to defend her, with no one courageous enough to

speak openly a word for her, in the face of the armed might of England and the formidable powers and terrors of the Church—for the dogmas and powers of the Church were the instruments used by her judges against her—out of that misery of chains and prison-darkness she came to her Trial. Mr Shaw, always agin the government of general opinion, alone among historians (a province that he occupies for this very brief occasion) has actually a good word to say for the presiding and prosecuting judge, Pierre Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, as well as for 'Brother Jean Lémaitre of the Order of Saint Dominic, Deputy of the Inquisitor of the Evil of Heresy in the Kingdom of France,' the auxiliary and co-operating judge. That Deputy of the Holy Inquisition may deserve some consideration, for we do discern glimmerings of kindness in his attitude towards the Maid; but of Pierre Cauchon, no. He was the servile instrument of the Earl of Warwick and of Beaufort, the 'Cardinal of England,' and determined to convict and execute. He was a tyrant, a toady, guilty of suppressing cogent facts that might benefit the prisoner, as the documents reveal, and of putting or encouraging subtle, entrapping questions. Beyond that he went further and worse—even so far as to send to Joan in gaol one of the assessors, a Canon of Rouen, Nicolas Loyseleur, disguised as her fellow-countryman from Lorraine and professing to be with her on the side of the French, as her confessor to cross-question her and advise her on the course to take, while two notaries were in hiding prepared to write down any incriminating answers. Further even than that, the base Loyseleur, lower than Judas, almost at the last was with her, and in his false friendly voice was counselling her to yield to the wishes of Cauchon and the Church. Surely, if there be a limbo of fiery punishment for the sinners of Earth, that loathly whisperer and betrayer will be the longest and deepest to burn! But always the real head of that offending was the Bishop of Beauvais, whom Mr Shaw, in his characteristic and delightful contradictoriness, insists on regarding as a spiritual citizen of duteousness and rectitude.

It was in the manner of her death that Joan best disproves Miss Murray's extreme assertion that she 'belonged to the ancient religion, not to the Christian';

for if that were so she could not have died as she did, with the name of Jesus frequently, passionately, and with yearning on her lips. The word was a prayer, sincere, a repeated prayer, as the rough cross, made for and given to her by an English soldier, and in the ecstasy of her agony pressed to her bosom, was the plain symbol of her accepted faith. It is simply impossible to believe that at such an hour of spiritual crisis, exaltation, and despair, she could have lied. Her natural frankness and fearlessness of persons, whatever their condition might be, with her confidence that God and His angels had guided her, were so evident that her open acknowledgment of Jesus through that awful climax was the right conclusion to her mission, her sufferings, and her life. Men watching and listening, soldiers, enemies, even monks, priests, and assessors, actually including the infamous Loyseleur, as well as many of the common people, then accepted her as true, and with lamentations confessed that they had burnt a saint. But with all her acceptance of God, of Jesus, and the glorious company of Heaven, she managed to refuse an implicit confidence in the Church, in that corrupt age so corrupt, whose Prelate, Deputy Inquisitor, and Doctors were trying her. Under the hard pressure of the examination she had averred that of the three divisions into which the Papal domination in recent years had been broken, she was for the Pope Martin in Rome and not for the schismatic Clement in Avignon or for that other and lesser would-be usurper, Benedict XIV, whose transient claims, supported by only one cardinal, are generally forgotten under the greater glamour of the other contending Pontiffs. Her attitude has given Mr Shaw the opportunity, if not the right, amusingly used, to claim for her the status of a Protestant saint, because when challenged over the particulars of her faith and called upon to accept the authority of the Church, she persistently referred back to God, whose counsel, through her Voices, she confidently accepted; refusing the intervention of the priests, but not rejecting any point of their doctrines.

And so we come to that aspect of the real Joan which has received a very strong impulse from the investigations and conclusions of Miss Margaret Murray. Once given the clue where to look and how to look, it is easy to see

that under the many shrewd questions asked of Joan, a further and deeper inquiry was being made. Outwardly it might appear that she was arraigned as the enemy of the English, captured in arms, and threatening their power as the true, or rather the legalised, rulers of France under the agreements forced upon the stricken country by Henry the Fifth. Really, however, the purpose of the Trial was deeper and more subtle. A supposed witch, who had defamed Christ and His Church and mocked its doctrines, rites, and practices, was there accused, and the most insistent of the questions showered on Joan were framed to discover heresy and the facts of her false beliefs. It is impossible, remembering the woman, high-souled, clean-hearted, pure of life, unfaltering in her assertions and answers, unselfish and gentle, as she was, to believe that her declared faith in God, Jesus, and the hierarchy of Heaven, of whom she asserted that the Archangel Michael and Saints Catherine and Margaret were her counsellors, her 'Voices,' was all one sham. It is beyond reason to think it for a moment. But she had inherited thoughts and tendencies which went back to the ancient gods of her country-side, superstitions, it may be, and deep-seated credulities, merged solidly with her acceptances of the Christian creed. She declared that 'there were books of Our Lord's beside what you have'; she acknowledged that on her letters, which she herself was unable to write, sometimes she marked a cross, not as a symbol of her religion but as a sign that what she said in the letter was to be read with the opposite meaning, undoubtedly an unusual act for one holding confessedly to the orthodox faith. Her wearing of a man's clothes, also, was taken as a most significant sign of her practice of witchcraft, and suggests that she was the head of one of the small communities of thirteen, the 'coven,' which constituted then a regularly-organised occult assembly. Of course, as Mr Bernard Shaw points out, it was the only right wear for a soldier in the field, and he applauds Joan as the pioneer of rational dress for women; but Beauvais and his sinister cronies saw there a challenging sign of witchcraft. They repeatedly urged her to dress as a woman; and because, after her relapse and its withdrawal, she at once resumed her masculine attire, her doom fell; she was summarily handed over to the secular

arm—her former fighting enemies—and executed. 'I would rather die than revoke what God has made me do,' she had declared, showing that her wearing of man's clothing was in obedience to spiritual direction.

The next point in this study of the inward faith of the real Joan cannot be better put than in Miss Murray's words. During her Trial :

'She also consistently refused to take an oath on the Gospels, and was with difficulty persuaded to do so on the Missal. When she was asked whether she had ever blasphemed [*blasphemeravit*] God, she replied that she had never cursed the Saints [*maledixit Sanctum vel Sanctam*]. When pressed whether she had not denied [*denegaverit*] God, she again refused a direct answer, saying that she had not denied the Saints [*denegaverit Sanctum nec Sanctam*].

'The general feeling towards her among the Christian priesthood is shown by the action of Brother Richard. When he first entered her presence "he made the sign of the cross and sprinkled holy water, and I said to him, Approach boldly, I shall not fly away "' (p. 274).

As for the alleged denials of God and of the saints it must be remembered that Joan was fencing with her masters a desperate duel, knowing that behind those leading questions were deep and unscrupulous purposes. Against them she must guard; as she did with an admirable readiness; and whenever a trivial question was asked, as often it was, she would reply with a simple 'Passez outre!'—'get on with it!' In the Trial she openly declared her faith in God, and sought refuge in Him as against the claims of the Church. Miss Murray, however, brings out a point which has some modifying effect. In Mr Douglas Murray's translation of the Evidence, the expression, as used by Joan, the 'King of Heaven' is rendered as 'our Lord,' and 'my Lord' as 'our Saviour.' This, of course, as Miss Murray claims, in that particular inquiry is not merely inaccurate but is positively misleading. The King of Heaven in the minds and fears of the practisers of the pre-Christian ritual wielded an influence vastly different from that of the 'pale Galilean.'

The Voices that gave Joan the spiritual counsel on which she acted, and still were with her in prison, though her faith in them under the loneliness of that harsh con-

finement faltered at times, were naturally the subject of most curious inquiry by her examiners, as they must be to those whose interest in them is merely scientific. The judges smelt witchcraft there, and their surmises or suspicions were sharpened by the circumstance that her saints, Catherine, Margaret, and Michael, first appeared to her, when she was a child of thirteen, near the Fairy Tree about which the youths and maidens of Domrémy danced and feasted in the spring and summer and on festival days. Those feastings and dancings, like the fairies of medieval times, were relics of unholy significance and were accepted by the churchmen as challenges to and denials of the true God of the Gospels. For that reason it was of urgent importance to discover Joan's attitude towards her Voices. The following extract from the interrogations in the prison at Rouen on the Easter Eve of 1431, as given by Mr Douglas Murray, is helpful in showing the absolute determination of her judges to convict, and the manner in which she took refuge in God.

'If the Church Militant tells you that your revelations are illusions, or diabolical things, will you defer to the Church?'

'I will defer to God, Whose Commandment I always do. I know well that that which is contained in my case has come to me by the Commandment of God; what I affirm in the Case is, that I have acted by the order of God: it is impossible for me to say otherwise. In case the Church should prescribe the contrary, I should not refer to any one in the world, but to God alone, Whose Commandment I always follow.'

'Do you not then believe you are subject to the Church of God which is on earth, that is to say to our Lord the Pope, to the Cardinals, the Archbishops, Bishops, and other prelates of the Church?'

'Yes, I believe myself to be subject to them; but God must be served first.'

'Have you command from your Voices not to submit yourself to the Church Militant, which is on earth, nor to its decision?'

'I answer nothing from my own head; what I answer is by command of my Voices; they do not order me to disobey the Church, but God must be served first' (p. 104).

Mr Shaw's Protestant saint! 'Responsio Johannaë superba!' Especially curious were the judges over the personal characteristics of the Voices. Was Michael

naked, or how was he clothed? Had he hair? Had he wings? She answered prudently. They could not entrap her. The point on which she seems to have been less well-guarded and convincing, though Miss Murray does not appear to have made the most of it, is over the mystery of the coronation at Rheims, when an angel, accompanied by herself and by a multitude of other angels, brought to the King a mystical crown 'of fine gold; it was so rich that I do not know how to count its riches or to appreciate its beauty.' The examiners cross-questioned her keenly over that crown and messenger; possibly because they suspected her as having been the 'angel' through her office as the local 'god' at the head of a coven. They made particular reference to it in the second of the twelve articles finally prepared for her impeachment, and described her statement as presumption, audacity, and lying, while especially repudiating her assertion that the angel bowed to the King, because they had not read of such potentates of the celestial hierarchy making a like reverence to any saint or 'even to the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God.'

They did not fairly convict her, but she had to be convicted—political pressure being relentless and over strong—and she was convicted, handed over to the soldiers, and burnt as a witch. Following the ritual of the judgment and execution of sorcerers, her ashes, as soon as they could be gathered, were cast into the Seine. So died one of the greatest of the aristocracy of life, to whom patriotism *was* enough; and who was ever truly womanly, even in the hours of her triumph, when, armed and armoured, she marched with her spirited comrades. But yet in all that proud circumstance she was simply human enough to weep at a foreign soldier's coarse insult to her womanhood, and could tend a dying enemy fallen on the field, helping to win for him religious consolation in the agonies of death. She had also her humour. When one of the notaries at her Trial blundered over an answer already given, she threatened amusedly to pull his ears. Such a prisoner, bravely humorous under that evil subjection, must have been sympathised with and released by any fair court. Her forbidding of swearing in the army is well known through her permission to the rough and genial La Hire that his only oath should be 'par mon

martin.' Even D'Alençon, a Prince of the Blood, acknowledged that in her presence he dared not swear. She was violently angry with the Scot who confessed that he had eaten stolen meat (as if any other kind of meat could have been as sweet and irresistible to a Scot of those wild days !), as with the foul women, illicit followers of the army, who traded on the vices of the soldiery. She chased them forcibly from the camp ; on the back of one of them she broke a sword. She was abstemious, eating and drinking habitually next to nothing ; a little bread daily soaked in sour wine. And so the saint is seen to be very naturally human throughout ; her strength and sweetness being merged with some of the lighter and kinder infirmities of this pleasant flesh.

The real Joan shines out of the bitter darkness of her times like a vital golden flame against the mirk. True woman she was ; as well as patriot, chieftain, and martyr. When, at the close of the coming May, the lauds and incense of the Church that canonised her rise to her ever-enduring honour, so, too, in the infinitely wider community of thoughtful hearts, gratitude for and pride in her deathless example will find expression ; for she, that village girl, who rode as an equal with warriors and princes, was the unspoilt sister of common men — 'even as you and I.' It may be, also, that in the hour of that especial remembrance, those wretches, the cunning, time-serving, harsh, and unrelenting political ecclesiastics, who, in kindling the flames of her pyre established the radiance of her immortality, also will be remembered — with pity ; while possibly the pagan gods of the old religion, shrouded and lost behind the mystery of dead ages, and surely actors in that tragedy of life and comedy of death, will echo with their mocking laughter the psalms and silver trumpets of Rome. . . .

But she died with the name of Jesus on her lips.

Art. 5.—THE MANDATES SYSTEM: ITS FIRST DECADE.

The Mandates System. By Norman Bentwich, O.B.E., M.C., Attorney-General of Palestine. Longmans, 1930.

MR NORMAN BENTWICH'S treatise on 'The Mandates System,' which forms one of a series of 'Contributions to International Law and Diplomacy,' under the able Editorship of Dr Arnold McNair, is a timely and valuable contribution to the history of a unique international experiment—the introduction into colonial administration of two simple principles—firstly, that the government of dependent territory is a trust for the inhabitants and for mankind at large, and secondly, that to this trust there must be attached an obligation on the part of the trustee to render to mankind continuous accounts of his stewardship. Mr Bentwich has special qualifications for the task of writing such a book as this. He is a distinguished jurist, and, as Attorney-General of Palestine, he has an intimate personal knowledge of the practical working of at least one of the Mandates, perhaps the most complicated and interesting of them all. It may be worth while to take advantage of the opportunity, afforded by the appearance of this volume, for a review of the origin, character, development, and administration of the mandatory system as a whole.

The 'protection' of one State by another has been a recognised international relationship from the Middle Ages downwards. Derived, perhaps, from the 'protection' owed by a superior to his vassal, it became in time a conventional arrangement 'involving a promise of protection in return for a *quid pro quo*—notably a certain accommodation to the wishes of the protector in matters of policy.* In theory, and at first in practice, conventions of this kind left the sovereignty of the protected State undiminished. Danzig stipulated for its retention in the treaty in which, in 1454, she accepted the protection of Poland, and, notwithstanding the French protectorate over Genoa in the fifteenth century, Genoese

* Baty, 'Protectorates and Mandates,' British Year Book of International Law, 1921-22, p. 109.

ambassadors were sent to Rome.* But States on whose side were 'the big battalions' were not likely, in the eighteenth or the early years of the nineteenth century, to acquiesce in the survival of 'self-denying ordinances.' The temptation to secure the control of the external relations of their *protégés* was too great to be overcome. No word occurs more frequently than 'protection' in the earlier volumes of Napoleon's 'Correspondence,' and we know exactly what he meant when he used it.

The Holy Alliance of 1815 in which the Sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia bound themselves, both in the administration of their own territories and in their political relations with each other, to take as their guide the principles of the Christian religion, struck an altruistic note with which Europe had long been unfamiliar, and which, in spite of the sinister reputation of the Holy Alliance later on, did not die away. Its dual message that powers of government should be exercised not for the exploitation, but in the interests, of the governed, and that States should take common action for great and unselfish ends had been received by the world and began to be gradually carried into execution. The Pact of the Holy Alliance had been signed in September 1815. In the following November, England received, under the Treaty of Paris, a mandate for the administration of the Ionian Islands, which she held till their cession to Greece in 1864. In 1860 France interfered in Syria under a mandate (Aug. 3, 1860) from Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, for the protection of the Maronites from persecution by the Druses.†

In 1885 and 1890 further steps were taken in the direction of international action of a protective character. In the General Act of the Congo Conference of Berlin (Feb. 26, 1885), the signatory Powers (Great Britain, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Norway, Turkey, and the United States of America) agreed, *inter alia*, to the prohibition of the Slave Trade within the

* Baty, *ad loc. cit.*, p. 110.

† On Feb. 4, 1887, Sir James Fergusson, then Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, claimed that England was in Egypt with the consent and by the mandate of Europe (Hansard, 3rd Ser., vol. 310, Col. 666). As to this, see Basdevant's Preface to Millot's 'Les Mandats Internationaux,' p. 3.

basin of the river Congo, and undertook to notify to one another all future occupations of territory on the coast of the African continent. The General Act of the Brussels Conference of 1890 (July 2, 1890) contained similar provisions as to the suppression of slavery, and the partial restriction of the spirit trade in Africa. Neither of these treaties, momentous as they were, established, however, any form of direct international control over the execution by the contracting parties of the obligations that they had undertaken.*

An experiment more closely related to the modern mandates system was initiated in Crete by the Treaty of Dec. 4, 1897, which brought to an end the Graeco-Turkish War of 1896.† Autonomy was conceded to the Island under the personal suzerainty of the Sultan, and its government was entrusted by the Treaty Powers (France, Great Britain, Italy, and Russia) to a High Commissioner (Prince George of Greece), who administered it with the aid of a College of Ministers, chosen by him but responsible to the Cretan Parliament. The High Commissioner was himself responsible to the Consuls of the four Powers, who were required to meet periodically and to see that the new régime was being properly carried out. The Island had already been divided, for military and administrative purposes, into five sections, four of which were occupied by units of French, English, Italian, and Russian troops respectively. These units maintained order and secured the working of certain branches of the administration and of the public services. Their commanders were answerable to the College of the four Consuls for the due performance of their mission.‡ Among other partial anticipations of the mandates system may be mentioned President Roosevelt's suggestion in 1906 that France and Spain should hold a joint Mandate for Morocco and report to Italy as the supervising authority on behalf of all the Powers, and the Mandates conferred by the Imperial Government on the Commonwealth of Australia for Papua and on the Dominion of South Africa for Basutoland and Bechuanaland.

* Van Maanen Helmer, 'The Mandates System,' p. 23.

† See Millot, *ubi sup.*, p. 29.

‡ The international forces were withdrawn in 1909 after the union of Crete with Greece.

At the conclusion of the Great War, the non-Turkish territories of the Ottoman Empire and the German Colonies in Africa and Oceania had passed definitely under Allied occupation. On one point the Allies were unanimous. In no circumstances would they permit Turkish domination over the former group, or German domination over the latter, to be restored. But here a cleavage of opinion and policy set in. President Wilson was glowing with enthusiasm for the principle of 'nationalities.' He had devoted to the old Turkish protectorates the 12th, and to the German colonies the 5th, of his '14 Points.' To the former, he wished to guarantee 'absolute security of existence' and 'a clear possibility of autonomous development.' For the latter, he demanded that, in the settlement of their future, equal weight should be given to 'the interests of the populations involved and to the equitable claims of the government whose title had to be defined.' As regards the non-Turkish Ottoman territories, no serious controversy arose. Commitments as to some, at least, of these, made during the war itself, would have rendered it impossible for England, and difficult for France, to support a policy of annexation. England had promised the Jews a National Home in Palestine. England and France had undertaken to favour the creation of an Arab Kingdom or a Confederation of Arab States.

But the German Colonies in Africa and Oceania stood in quite a different position: France, Great Britain, and the British Dominions Overseas, so it was felt and argued, had spent blood and money in wresting them from the enemy while the United States of America was still reaping, in full harvest, the fruits of a highly profitable neutrality. To some of these possessions, the principle of nationalities was scarcely applicable at all. In the case of others, with sparse and widely scattered populations, the suggestion of its application seemed ludicrous. Nor did Mr Wilson himself appear to have any clear notions on the subject. He was resolutely hostile to annexation. He had a vague desire to see the German Colonies 'internationalised.' But with a *condominium*, if that was what he meant, no one, after Samoa, wished to have anything to do. There was nothing new in the requirement that when the fate of the German Colonies

was being decided, due weight should be accorded to 'the interests of the populations involved.' As Lord Lugard has pointed out in his work on 'The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa,' the twofold purpose of the government of backward countries—on the one hand, the well-being and development of the inhabitants, on the other, the benefit of all mankind—had been adopted in British Colonial practice before the modern Mandates System was introduced.

At this juncture appeared General Smuts' brochure—'The League of Nations.' Its 'practical suggestion' may be stated in the formula—'colonial administration under international surveillance.' It is tolerably clear* that, in this famous pamphlet, General Smuts was thinking only of the non-Turkish territories of the Ottoman Empire and of new communities that might spring up on the expected disintegration of Austria, Hungary, and Russia. The German Colonies in East and West Africa, he regarded as a special case, for which a solution should be found, at the Peace Conference, on the lines indicated in President Wilson's '5th Point'—a solution, that is to say, in which equal weight should be assigned to the interests of the colonists and the equitable claims of their governors. He had no desire to see any of these colonies 'internationalised,' and he very definitely contemplated the incorporation of German South-West Africa into the South-African Union. President Wilson seized on General Smuts' 'practical suggestion' and sought to make it applicable to the enemies' territories as a whole. After considerable controversy, a compromise was arrived at, and the modern Mandates System was promulgated by Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.† Postulating the *fact* that among the colonies and territories which had ceased, by reason of the war, to be under the sovereignty of the Central Powers and their Allies, 'some are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves, under the strenuous conditions of the modern

* See Rolin, 'La Pratique des Mandats,' Rec. des Cours, vol. xix, pp. 503, 514.

† This Article is identical in substance with Article 19 of the original draft of the Covenant, published on Feb. 13, 1919. The new Article requires the Mandate to be accepted by the Mandatory, and adds to the obligation of the latter that of securing 'equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.'

world,' and the *principle* that 'the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilisation,' Article 22 declares that practical effect may best be given to this mission by confiding, 'the tutelage of such peoples' to 'advanced nations' as 'Mandatories on behalf of the League.'

The character of the Mandate must differ, however, 'according to the stage of the development of the people,' the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions and other similar circumstances. Three different types of Mandate (A, B, and C) were, therefore, recognised. Class A was applicable to 'communities,' such as 'certain of those formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire, whose stage of development justified their provisional recognition as independent nations.' Here the function of the Mandatory would be to render 'administrative advice and assistance until such time as they are able to stand alone.' Class B comprised peoples, 'especially those of Central Africa,' whose stage of development necessitated 'administration' by the Mandatory under conditions securing (1) freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order, (2) the prohibition of abuses, e.g. slavery, and the arms and liquor traffic, (3) the restriction of military and naval bases, and the raising of local forces, to police purposes and the defence of territory, and (4) freedom for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League. Class C included territories, such as South-West Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, whose sparse population, remoteness from the centres of civilisation or geographical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory made it desirable that they should be administered as an integral part of his territory, 'subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.'

Provision was made for the presentation of an annual Report by each Mandatory, and for the appointment of a Permanent Mandates Commission to examine the Reports and advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the Mandates. The distribution of the Mandates followed in due course. In Class A, Iraq and Palestine (July 24, 1922) went to England, Syria and Lebanon (July 24, 1922) to France. Under Article 119

of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany renounced her title to her colonies in East and West Africa in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. These colonies, constituting Class B under the Mandates System, were divided by the Supreme Council of these Powers (July 20, 1922) between Great Britain (parts of German East Africa, Togoland, and the Cameroons), France (parts of Togoland and the Cameroons), and Belgium (part of German East Africa). In the Class C group, the following distribution was arrived at (Dec. 17, 1920). The former German possessions north of the Equator went to Australia, Nauru to Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, Samoa to New Zealand; German possessions south of the Equator to Japan, and—the object on which General Smuts had set his heart—German South-West Africa to the South African Union. A few stray points of discord had been settled by special agreements between the Powers concerned. Belgium obtained a larger slice of German East Africa by the cession to her by Great Britain of the districts of Ruanda and Urundi. She subsequently, with the authorisation of the Council of the League, retroceded a portion of this territory to Great Britain, who has brought it under the Mandate for Tanganyika.* Portugal reclaimed and recovered Kionga in East Africa, taken from her by Germany in 1894, and attached it to Mozambique. Italy acquired Jubaland by agreement with Great Britain and a rectification of her Libyan frontier at the expense of France. The United States, which was not on the Supreme Council and was not a Member of the League, claimed the internationalisation, under a special statute, of the tiny Island of Yap (situated between the Philippines and Carolines), which had been included in the Mandate to Japan, alleging that it had never formed part of the German possessions north of the Equator, but was eventually satisfied by an agreement (Feb. 11, 1922) safeguarding her right of free access to it in connection with all questions of cables and wireless telegraphy. Similar agreements were concluded by the United States with other Mandatory Powers. Armenia was the worst sufferer in the struggle over the allocation of Mandates.

* Mandates cannot be modified without the consent of the Council of the League. The question of surrender or withdrawal is not envisaged in any mandate, and has not yet directly arisen.

The American Senate refused to sanction the Mandate offered to President Wilson for that 'distressful country,' whose right to recognition as a free and independent State had been accepted by the Treaty of Sèvres. But that Treaty was never ratified. Part of the Armenian territory came under the sovereignty of Soviet Russia, and part reverted to Turkey in 1923 under the Treaty of Lausanne, which gave Armenia no rights except such protection, if any, as she could derive from its general provisions as to minorities.

The three categories of Mandates have certain points in common. In each the Mandatory is required to present an annual Report to the Council of the League of Nations. Each imposed upon him an obligation to submit to the Permanent Court of International Justice any dispute, which cannot be settled by negotiation, between himself and another Member of the League of Nations, as to the interpretation or the application of the terms of the Mandate. In regard to each, the question of the nationality of the subjects of the Mandate has received a similar solution. Except in the case of Palestine, the Mandates themselves were silent on the point, and some uncertainty in regard to it at first prevailed. Japan claimed that the natives of the islands under her Mandate were Japanese subjects as of right, New Zealand declared that the Samoans were not British subjects as of right and that naturalisation should be refused to them. The issue eventually came up for direct decision in the case of the German settlers in South-West Africa, who had not been repatriated after the War. On a report (May 12, 1922) by the Permanent Mandates Commission, the Council of the League adopted (April 23, 1923) a resolution that the status of native inhabitants of a mandated territory is distinct from that of the nationals of the Mandatory Power. They are not invested with the nationality of that Power by reason of the protection extended to them, but individual inhabitants of that territory may voluntarily obtain naturalisation from the Mandatory Power in accordance with any legislation that such Power may see fit to enact with that object.

The Council of the League added that it was desirable that native inhabitants who receive the protection of a mandatory Power should in each case be designated by

some form of descriptive title which will specify their status under the Mandate. At a later date, the following description was adopted: 'Natives of . . . administered under Mandate . . . ' (*indigènes du . . . administré sous Mandat . . .*)* In the Report for 1928 of the South African Union on German South-West Africa, the position of the native inhabitants is dealt with thus: 'No special national status has been conferred on the native inhabitants of the territory. They are regarded as persons without nationality under the protection of the mandatory, in terms of legal opinion' (par. 17); and again: 'They enjoy the same guarantees as regards the protection of their persons and property within the territory of the Mandatory as the native inhabitants of the latter' (par. 18). In these paragraphs, the term 'inhabitants,' in the Mandate is treated as applicable both to European settlers and to natives. In view of the uncertainty of the effect of Union legislation on the point, the Permanent Mandates Commission in 1929 resolved to suggest to the Council of the League that the question might merit reference to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The South African Union—and the same observation applies to New Zealand as regards Samoa—has, however, given large facilities, of which in South-West Africa a majority of the German settlers has taken advantage, to the inhabitants of the mandated territory to become British by naturalisation. It may be worth noting here that it has been held in South Africa that the relation between the Mandatory Power and a native inhabitant may be such as to justify a conviction of the latter for high treason.†

Apart, however, from these common factors, the rights and obligations of the Mandatory differ according to the category to which his Mandate belongs. A brief analysis of the terms of a typical example of the three Classes above-mentioned may suffice to make the position clear. As an instance of Class A, we may take the French Mandate for Syria and Lebanon. Special observations, which shall be made hereafter, are suggested by the British Mandates for Iraq and Palestine.

* Millot, 'Les Mandats Internationaux,' p. 120.

† *Christian v. R.* (1923, Nov. 30, Sup. Ct. of South Africa), British Year Book of International Law, 1924, p. 227.

Syria and Lebanon were non-Turkish territories of the former Ottoman Empire. The Treaty of Sèvres of Aug. 10, 1920, recognised (Article 92) their status as one of 'provisional independence.' The Treaty of Sèvres, however, though signed, was not ratified, and the Treaty of Lausanne, by which Turkey renounced her rights over certain of her non-Turkish territories, Syria and Lebanon included, contained no acknowledgment of their autonomy. But the Mandate for these States, granted, as we have seen, on July 24, 1922, assumed their title to provisional independence. On July 27, 1922, it was adopted by the League of Nations on that basis, as a Mandate in Class A. The primary duty of France under Article 22 of the Covenant was, therefore, by 'administrative advice and assistance' to help Syria and Lebanon in their march towards the goal of complete autonomy. During the period of tutelage, of course, the powers of the Mandatory are extensive. He has the exclusive control of the external relations of the mandated territory and is responsible for the ex-territorial diplomatic and consular protection of its nationals (Article 3). He is, in a word, for the time being, an adviser, whose advice must be followed. Moreover, in the Mandate for Syria and Lebanon (Article 2 (2)), as indeed in the Mandate for Palestine (Article 17), the normal restriction of the use of local military forces to police purposes and the defence of the territory is relaxed by the curious clause—'*À moins que le mandataire ne l'autorise.*' But, in the main, the terms of the Mandate faithfully reproduce the spirit of Article 22 of the Covenant. The organic law which the Mandatory is required to promulgate is to be prepared 'in accord with' the native authorities and to take account of the rights, interests and wishes of all the inhabitants (Article 1 (2)). The gradual formation of 'local autonomies' is to be encouraged (Article 1 (3)). The 'trust property'—i.e. the mandated territory—is to be guaranteed against loss, alienation, or foreign interference (Article 4). A judicial system is to be established which will ultimately supersede the old capitulatory régime (Article 5 and 6). In pursuance of this obligation, special Courts for foreigners were, on May 1, 1924, set up through the whole mandated territory. In the State of Great Lebanon, these were, in 1925, fused

with the Native Courts. Liberty of conscience and worship is to be secured (Article 8). The activities of religious missions are to be free from any control, except such as may be necessary for the maintenance of public order and good administration (Article 10). Antiquities are to be preserved, and all Members of the League of Nations are to have equal rights in regard to them (Article 14). Special conventions are to be concluded to safeguard the native population against slavery, the liquor traffic, etc., and to secure freedom of commerce (Article 12). The territory covered by the French Mandate for Syria and Lebanon has been divided, in accordance with the wishes of a majority of the inhabitants, into four sections: (1) States of Syria, with their capital at Damascus. A constitution for this section was promulgated on May 22, 1930; (2) Great Lebanon, which received a Constitution in 1926; (3) State of the Alaouites (capital, Lattakia), under direct French administration; (4) State of the Jebel Druze, under French military administration.

As types of Class B, may be taken the French and British Mandates for Togo. They bear the same date—July 20, 1922—and are almost identical in terms. The provisional delimitation of the frontier is effected in accordance with a Franco-British declaration of July 10, 1919, but the Mandates provided (Article 1) for its final adjustment by a Mixed Commission, which presented its Report on Oct. 21, 1929. The Mandatory is responsible for the peace, order and good administration of the territory and is to further, by all the means in his power, the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants (Article 2). In pursuance of this end, he shall (a) provide for the eventual emancipation of all slaves, and for as speedy an elimination of all slavery, domestic and otherwise, as social conditions permit; (b) suppress every form of traffic in slaves; (c) prohibit forced labour, except for essential public services and under the condition of equitable remuneration; (d) supervise, for the protection of the natives, contracts for the employment and recruiting of labour; (e) exercise a strict control over the arms, munitions, and liquor traffic (Article 4). There are the usual restrictions on the erection of fortifications and the use of local forces

(Article 3). France is, however, invested, in this latter respect, with a power which is omitted from the British Mandate. She may, 'in the event of a general war,' use the local forces, 'to repel an attack or for the defence of the territory outside the region subject to the Mandate' (Article 3 (2)). Native laws and customs are to be taken account of in legislation; transfers of land, except between natives, and the creation of real rights over native land, in favour of non-natives, are prohibited, save with the consent of the public authorities; strict regulations are to be promulgated against usury (Article 5). Elaborate provision is made, for securing equality of treatment for the nationals of other Members of the League, for the control of concessions and monopolies (Article 6), for freedom of conscience and worship, and for the operations of religious missions (Article 7).

In the Togo Mandates, however, we find ourselves surrounded no longer by an atmosphere of 'provisional autonomy.' The Mandatory has 'full powers of administration and legislation' in the mandated area, which under the reservations indicated above, is to be 'administered, in accordance with the laws of the Mandatory, as an integral part of his territory' (Article 9 (1)). He may apply to it his own laws, subject to the modifications required by local conditions, and may constitute it into a customs, fiscal or administrative union or federation with adjacent territories under his control, if, in doing so, he does not infringe the provisions of the Mandate (Article 9 (2)). Thus British Togoland is administered in two Sections—a Northern, under the laws of the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast Colony, and a Southern, on the lines of a District of that Colony. In French Togo, Courts for Europeans, on the ordinary French model, were established by a decree of Aug. 8, 1920, modified by a decree of Aug. 22, 1928, and Native Tribunals by decrees of Nov. 22, 1922, and May 16, 1928.

Of Class C we may select as an example the Mandate granted on Dec. 17, 1920, to the South African Union over German South-West Africa. Here again the Mandatory receives plenary powers of administration. The mandated area is to be administered as an integral part of his own territory. The legislation of the Union, with any necessary modifications, may be applied (Article 2

(1)). The well-being and social progress of the inhabitants are to be promoted (Article 2 (2)). Slave trade and the supply of spirits to natives are prohibited. So is forced labour, except for necessary public works and adequate remuneration. Traffic in arms and munitions is controlled (Article 3). The ordinary restriction on the raising of local forces is imposed. There is an absolute prohibition of the establishment of any military or naval base or fortification (Article 4). Freedom of conscience, worship and missionary enterprise is assured (Article 5). It will be observed that, in Class C, the Mandatory is not subject to the obligation of providing equal opportunity for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

The British Mandates for Iraq and Palestine present special features to which reference must be made. The position in Iraq was complicated from the first by the undertaking given by Great Britain during the War to Hussein. The existence of that promise naturally made both the use of the term 'Mandate' and the introduction of the 'Mandate System' unpopular in a country which, according to the 'nomination in the bond,' was to have been raised to the dignity of a Kingdom. Great Britain, accordingly, with the approval of the League of Nations, endeavoured to solve the problem by concluding with King Feisul, Hussein's son, a treaty of alliance in which her obligations in great measure devolved on the King, who undertook, however, to accept the 'administrative advice and assistance' of the guardian Power. This treaty was ratified in 1924, and Great Britain, on her part, undertook to bring it to an end in four years by moving for the admission of Iraq into the League of Nations. The difficulty was not yet, however, at an end.

In 1925, the Permanent Court of International Justice in an 'advisory opinion' on a question, referred to it by the Council of the League, as to the boundary between Iraq and Turkey in Mosul, recommended, as a condition of its award, that the treaty of 1924 should remain in force for not less than twenty-five years. In 1927, a fresh draft treaty was prepared in which Great Britain bound herself to press for the admission of Iraq into the League in 1932, if the progress of the country were maintained. Two years later, Britain made further efforts to implement her promises. She proposed to the

League the establishment, in lieu of the old capitulations, of a simple judicial system, in which the rights of foreigners would be guaranteed by the general supervision of British judges; and, at the end of 1929, the British representative on the Council intimated that his Government would, without qualification, press for the admission of Iraq into membership of the League of Nations in 1932.*

The British Mandate for Palestine, to which Mr Bentwich naturally gives considerable attention, has, during the past few years, been so much in the public eye that a brief reference to it here must suffice. Its character has been determined by its central object—the establishment of the National Home for the Jews. Although the Mandate for Palestine, which was one of the non-Turkish territories of the former Ottoman Empire, renounced by Turkey in the Treaty of Lausanne, nominally belongs to Class A, it contains no concession to Palestine of the provisional independence contemplated by Article 22 of the Covenant. On the contrary, it is drawn up on the lines of direct administration, approximating, in this respect, more closely to Mandates of the B and C Classes than to those of the A type. But, unlike all the other Mandates of each Class, it introduces a form of dual control, distributing the rights and obligations that it creates between the 'Mandatory' and the 'Palestine Administration,' and seems to envisage, as M. Van Rees has pointed out,† some future transfer of the Administration to an autonomous organisation, whose constitution is provided for, as the effective 'Government' of the country (Article 28).

The Mandate for Palestine requires the enactment of a nationality law 'facilitating the acquisition' of Palestinian citizenship by Jews resident in the country, and this requirement has been complied with.

'While Palestine comprises two principal national elements,' says Mr Bentwich, 'there is one single Palestinian citizenship. And the conditions for obtaining that citizenship are the same for all persons, whether Jews, Arabs, or foreigners. The injunc-

* See Bentwich, 'Sublimation of the Mandate for Iraq,' British Year Book of International Law, 1930, p. 193; Diena, 'Les Mandats Internationaux,' Rec. des Cours, vol. v, p. 253.

† 'Les Mandats Internationaux,' vol. II, pp. 100 *et seq.*

tion in the Mandate that the law is to facilitate the acquisition of citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence is met by the requirement of a short period of residence for naturalisation, viz. two years.'

Having thus traced the origin, character, and development of the Mandate régime, which covers an area of $1\frac{1}{4}$ million square miles, and embraces a population of over 20 millions, we may notice briefly, in conclusion, the different parts of the machinery by which the system is worked. 'The Mandatory,' says Mr Bentwich, 'is a protector with a conscience, and what is more—a keeper of his conscience.' He is responsible to the League of Nations, to whose Council his Annual Reports are presented and whose Assembly has the right to discuss his acts. He is amenable to the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in the event of disputes with other Members of the League of Nations, as to the interpretation or application of the Mandate, and, as regards Mandates issued to Great Britain or the Dominions, to that also of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council where the circumstances warrant the exercise of the powers granted by the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts.* But the pivot of the supervision by the League of Nations of the administration of the different Mandatories is, and must be, the Permanent Mandates Commission, for whose establishment Article 22 of the Covenant expressly provided. The Assembly might serve as a link between the League and world-wide civilised opinion, and might give tone to the system in discussing the periodical reports of the Council. To the Council, the Mandatory was immediately responsible. But both the Council and, *a fortiori*, the Assembly, would be largely dependent, for the information on which the decisions of the former and the reflections of the latter would have to be based, on the work done by the Permanent Mandates Commission. It was, therefore, a matter of paramount importance that the Commission should be thoroughly well equipped for its task, and to the achievement of this end the Council applied itself. The Commission was constituted on Nov. 29, 1920. It

* *Jerusalem-Jaffa District Governor v. Suleiman Pasha* (1926), Appeal Cases, p. 321.

was composed of nine members, of whom the majority consists of nationals of non-mandatory States. No member can, during his membership, exercise in his own country any function that brings him under the direct authority of his own government.

The Commission held its first meeting on Oct. 4, 1921. Once fairly launched on its career, the Commission set about the task of defining and establishing its jurisdiction.* That it was merely an advisory body, with no powers of executive control, could not be gainsaid. But, point by point, the Permanent Commission succeeded in making good its claim (a) to receive from the Mandatory not simply a general account of his stewardship, but an annual record of the details of his administration, conforming to the requirements of a standing series of interrogatories and documented by copies of all relevant laws and regulations; (b) to submit to the Council of the League not only its observations on particular Reports, but any general suggestions for the improvement of the administration, whether arising out of the Report or not; (c) to entertain and report upon petitions from the inhabitants of mandated territories, transmitted to it through the channel of the mandatory Governments concerned. The Council, however, declined to recognise the right of the Commission to hold official 'hearings' of petitions, and a suggestion that it should, as such, act if necessary as a Commission of inquiry within any mandated territory was overruled by the Commission itself.† It need scarcely be added that ample opportunity is given to every mandatory, if he so desires, to make his own representations to the Commission on the consideration of his Report or of any petition, and to support such representations before the Council at the proper time.

The Mandates Commission has displayed an extraordinary alertness in investigating the causes of any disturbances in mandated territory and the means of removing the unrest underlying them,‡ and its proceedings

* On the whole subject, see Van Rees, 'Les Mandats Internationaux,' vol. I, p. 56; Diena, 'Les Mandats Internationaux,' Rec. des Cours, vol. V, pp. 227, 257; Rolin, 'La Pratique des Mandats,' Rec. de Cours, vol. XIX, p. 543.

† Van Rees, vol. I, p. 135.

‡ E.g. the rising in Syria in 1925-26; the Bondelswarts rebellion in

have belied the confident prediction of critics of the scheme at its inception that a mandate would merely be a stepping-stone to annexation. When, in 1926, a treaty between the South African Union and Portugal recited that the Union 'subject to the terms of the Mandate, possesses sovereignty over the territory of South-West Africa,' the Commission interposed, and insisted on the distinction between territories under sovereignty and those under mandate being recognised. Again, when, in a Belgian law, Ruanda was described as 'administratively united' with the Belgian Congo, the necessity for correcting the suggestion that a mandated territory is 'completely identified' with a Colony was emphasised; and, in a decree in which French Togoland was incidentally termed a 'French State,' the substitution of the expression 'mandated territory' was secured.

The first decade in the history of the Mandates System has closed. Dr McNair has said elsewhere that 'it represents the irruption of the idealist into one of the periodical world settlements which have, in the past, lain too much in the hands of so-called practical men.'* Is the idealist 'making good'? To this question an affirmative answer must be returned. The inauguration of the system was attended with difficulties, partly due to human infirmities, partly inevitable. The Permanent Mandates Commission was apt, at times, to endeavour to convert itself into a Permanent Mandates Inquisition, and to lose sight of the forest in its meticulous examination of the trees. Mandatories were suspicious of its operations and dealt with its *questionnaires* in the spirit of defendants in civil litigation, who say as little as possible in reply to embarrassing interrogatories. Sharp repartees and caustic comments, particularly in the course of the controversy as to petitions, were not unknown. Moreover, the task of working out the mutual relations of the Assembly and the Council of the League, the Mandates Commission and the Mandatory Powers was onerous and intricate. We have seen how the provision of a National Home for the Jews has altered the character of the Mandate for Palestine.

South-West Africa; the unrest in Samoa; and the troubles in Palestine, 1928-29.

* Preface to 'The Mandate for Palestine,' by J. Stoyanovsky.

But no one can study the proceedings of the Mandates Commission and the Reports presented to it by the Mandatory Powers without observing the increasing harmony with which those two vital parts of the machinery of the system are now co-operating. On the one hand, the Commission has steadily dissociated itself from any attempt to interfere with the constitutional and administrative arrangements of the Mandatory, so long as these involve no departure from the spirit and requirements of the Mandate itself. The Mandatories, on the other hand, are becoming every year more ready, and indeed eager, to associate themselves with the labours of the Commission and to appear before it and before the Council of the League on the consideration of their Reports.

The Council of the League at the close of its third session (December 1923) made the following Minute on the result of its examination of the work submitted by the Permanent Mandates Commission: 'Le Conseil a constaté avec satisfaction que les territoires sous mandat sont généralement administrés en conformité à la lettre et à l'esprit de l'article 22.' That verdict holds good. The conclusion can best be summed up by Mr Bentwich:

'The system, which at first provoked the cynicism of statesmen and the sceptical observations of jurists, has shown itself a stable construction of the International Society. It was said by an eminent authority some years ago that the Mandate, although conceived in generosity, was born in sin. But the record of the administration of the territories placed under Mandate and of the activities of the Mandatory Powers and of the Permanent Mandates Commission during the ten years that the system has been in existence, has on the whole justified the incursion of idealism into the domain of the conqueror.'

A. WOOD RENTON.

Art. 6.—EDWARD FITZGERALD.

JUST one hundred years ago the 'Athenæum' published some very beautiful lyrical verses under title, 'The Meadows in Spring.' The author signed himself 'Epsilon.' By reason of their beauty and a quality of whimsical pathos, the Editor supposed Charles Lamb to be their author. But Lamb disclaimed them, with regret, writing to his friend Moxon: 'The "Athenæum" has been hoaxed' ('hoaxed' because, apparently unknown to the Editor, the verses had already appeared in Hone's 'Year Book' for April 30, 1831) 'with some exquisite poetry. I do not know who wrote it, but 'tis a poem I envy.' It was not till more than sixty years later that Dr Aldis Wright traced, and identified beyond possible doubt, their true parent—Edward FitzGerald.

Edward FitzGerald was born on the last day of March 1809. He must have come of age while he was making the stanzas. Yet they are all about old cronies gossiping. For title they have 'The Meadows in Spring,' and there are thirteen of them; yet not till we have done with ten—that is to say only in the last three—do we hear about Spring or the Meadows at all. For the rest we are in autumn and winter snug by the fireside. We never look out at 'the leaves falling fast:'

' But close at the hearth,
Like a cricket, sit I,
Reading of summer
And chivalry—
Gallant chivalry !

' Then with an old friend
I talk of our youth
How 'twas gladsome, but often
Foolish forsooth !
But gladsome, gladsome !

' And sometimes a tear
Will rise in each eye,
Seeing the two old friends
So merrily,
So merrily !

' And ere to bed
Go we, go we,
Down on the ashes
We kneel by the knee
Praying together ! '

Curious, is it not, this croon of the old friends from a lad of twenty-one ? But more curious still when we know what the life of that lad was to be. For the verses are prophetic. The way in which the old cronies are envisaged is precisely the way that their creator was to follow ; and always he was of their age—never from the first quite young, never to the last mentally old—of a changeless middle-age all through.

It is very curious ; but then there is nothing about Edward FitzGerald that is not curious. That such as he should come of such upbringing as he had is itself freakish. For he was bred in circumstances of the son of a rich country squire of the day, that is to say in an atmosphere of horses, hounds, hunting, shooting, and the like ; and from that breeding he grew to be a shy retiring student who never, by the record, did an athletic act in his life. The first home of his youth was in the White House, Bredfield, in Suffolk, about a mile and a half from Woodbridge. There he was born, and to the neighbourhood of his nativity he kept faithfully returning throughout his seventy-four years of life as if it were a magnet to him. For school, Edward went, when he was twelve, to King Edward's School in Bury St Edmunds. There he had for school-mates, Spedding, the great Baconian authority, and W. B. Donne, who were to be his life-long friends. We may believe that he laid the foundations of his writing style there, for Dr Malkin, the Head, was a venerator of pure English. J. M. Kemble, also a fellow-scholar and friend of FitzGerald's, became famous as a student of the Anglo-Saxon.

From Bredfield, his parents moved, in 1825, to Wherstead Lodge, near Ipswich, a large house, with good shooting and a fine collection of pictures of the English school. That move had its influence, we may be sure, on Edward. His intense love for pictures and some of his highly skilled judgment of them, was probably formed in those very impressionable years when he was passing from a schoolboy to become an undergraduate, for when he was

seventeen he was sent to Trinity, Cambridge. He was there four years, and what those years did for his growth we have to infer, for we are told little, and the inference is that they did little. They gave him perhaps small Latin and less Greek, but enough for him to get a pass degree which never seems to have been of any use to him. It gave him, however, certain friends whose value was beyond estimation, and it gave us, by his pen, 'Euphranor.'

Friends and friendship had a very first place in FitzGerald's life. We are not likely to be able to think of another man to whom friends counted for so much. And some of them were remarkable. We have seen him already linking schoolboy hands with Spedding, Kemble and Donne. The first two were also at Cambridge with him. Then there were W. M. Thackeray, W. H. Thompson, afterwards Master of Trinity and an occasion to E. F. G. of much letter-writing. There was John Allen, later Archdeacon of Salop, but best known because it is to him that the famous letters most intimately reveal their writer. There were Monckton Milnes, later Lord Houghton, and Frank Edgeworth, brother of Maria, the novelist. The three brothers Tennyson were also at Cambridge in his time, but it seems that he did not know them there, though his friendship with two of them later was to be very close. Many of the letters are to Frederic Tennyson, and much in them is about Alfred. Of the young men at Trinity, and at Cambridge more largely, Spedding, as FitzGerald says, was 'the pope,' and throughout their lives he never lost his infallibility with this faithfullest of friends.

Evidently he liked Cambridge, and Cambridge, that is the undergraduate society he met there, liked him. It was but natural that he should be happy there. He was easy-going, ready to be amused and amusing, with plenty of money which he did not spend because his tastes were very cheaply supplied. He must have been a dreadfully untidy fellow. We get a glimpse of him, from sketches attributed to Spedding and from by-the-way hints, as a tall loose-limbed youth, with pleasant face and dreamy eyes, careless beyond belief about his clothes. It is on record that once when his mother came up to see him, arriving, as her wont was, in great magnificence and a coach drawn by four coal-black horses, she sent for him,

but he was unable to come to her, he having in the world but one pair of boots and one of that pair, for the moment, was at the cobbler's. Later he grew stout and heavy, and if he had dressed to the character might have filled the rôle of Country Squire. But his eyes, according to the portraits, never lost that dreaminess which is of the poet rather than of the clod.

In his 'Euphranor,' a dialogue in the Platonic form in which Cambridge undergraduates are the speakers, a principal part is given to one Phiddipus, of whom the original was William Kenworthy Browne. Browne, however, was not at Cambridge, and FitzGerald did not meet him till a year or two after the Cambridge days. But at first meeting he seems to have grappled Browne with the very holding tentacles of his friendship and so to have held him till his death, by accident, twenty years later. Besides these, he had already, in his schooldays, made two strange and strangely contrasted friends, the Quaker Bernard Barton and an old Anglo-Indian Major Moor, whose house near Woodbridge must have been like a small museum of Eastern idols.

Already we see some of the makings of the man that Edward FitzGerald was to be. From his mother, a dashing lady whom we should expect to find devoted to Byron, he must have inherited her most paradoxical love of Crabbe, and Crabbe comes so often in the son's letters that we may almost say in our haste that the poor poet was his 'King Charles's Head.' Then there were his groundings in the classics, preparing him for his later exceedingly free versions of the Greek tragedians. There was Dr Malkin at King Edward's School preaching the cult of pure English—whatever that may mean, for FitzGerald never affected the purism of Saxon words without the blend of Latin which has made our language twice blest. Then there was that good group at Cambridge, including the Tennysons a little later, to send him along the current of literature which he took to naturally. There was the old warrior with his gods and his talk of the East to prepare the soil for the sowing of Omar. Would it be too fanciful to say that the accident—almost the calamity—of a favourite sister of such a name as Andalusia may have sent his thoughts towards Spain and the Calderon plays? With a marvellous gift for friendship, he was, thus,

rather marvellously gifted with friends. They were no common company. But had their quality been far less rare, he would have given them qualities. He was a most generous hero-worshipper. The hero, of course, is just what the worshipper makes him, and FitzGerald was a genius in that kind. Incidentally 'Euphranor' supplies a very good instance of it.

We ought to look at 'Euphranor' from several different points of view, because from each of them it gives us something different to think about. It was written, or at least published, in 1851, twenty years or so after he left Cambridge. The interval was enough, we should suppose, for him to be able to see University life whole and in its right perspective, and it is Cambridge University life that 'Euphranor' is about. As a dialogue on the Platonic model, it is a very fine imitation. The spirit of Platonic give-and-take in talk is well kept, the changing incidents are like the original, and there is a 'moral' in it. That is Platonic. And it is a very singular 'moral,' most singular when we consider the author. For its main design is to point to what he deemed a cardinal lack in the University training, that it was concerned too greatly with the things of the spirit and the mind, too little with the body and the muscle. He might have put it that the training was too much *μουσική*, too little *γυμναστική*. That in itself is curious—that the training at Cambridge University, no more than a hundred years ago, could be charged with such a fault. Still more curious must it seem that the accusation is brought by a man so very much of the 'musical kind'—in the wide Greek sense—as FitzGerald, so little of the gymnast. The very idea of 'Old Fitz' in a gymnasium gives us a pleasant smile.

So this was curious. But, most amazing of all, it is that FitzGerald really hoped, even expected, that his thin brown booklet should achieve something practical, should change the training in the direction that he desired. It is almost incredible, but it is obvious that he really did so expect, because we find him writing many years later to Professor Cowell of his disappointment: 'I remember being anxious about it twenty years ago, because I thought it was the truth (as if my telling it could mend the matter !); and I cannot but think that the generation that

has grown up in these twenty years has not profited by the Fifty Thousand Copies of this great work !' He took this effort seriously. He even signed his name to it—which was very rare. It was also rare with him to regard any of his own literary doings seriously, or, at least, to allow it to be suspected that he did. And seeing all this, may we not ask ourselves whether it is not possible that this comparatively early disappointment affected him through later life, throwing him, a naturally shy sensitive man, back within his reserves, convincing him that he was meant for no really big work in the world, intensifying his distrust of his creations ? I can believe that it had this effect.

As pure literature, in its own line, 'Euphranor' must rank high. Mr A. C. Benson is, I think, rather hard on it. He notes that the characters, the actors, lack substance ; are not very definite. He complains that the argument goes too discursively and that the structure of the moral plan is not firmly laid. Yes, but even in the great originals, Plato's own dialogues, do the characters much more vividly live ? Are not the arguments there, too, allowed to lead us by many pleasant bypaths ? Alfred Tennyson, who did not lightly praise, said of the description of the boat-race which comes in towards the end, that it was one of the most beautiful pieces of English prose.

Particular appreciation has inevitably been paid to the lovely rhythm of the closing cadence with its so appropriate thought about the homecoming 'across the meadows leading to the town, whither the dusky troop of gownsmen with all their confused voices seemed as if it were evaporating in the twilight, while a nightingale began to be heard among the chestnuts of Jesus.' It may perhaps be said that the idea, once suggested, is obvious enough—the first lovely bars of the night-bird's evening hymn as a close to the day's work or play. Yes, and largely because it is obvious, once suggested, is it beautiful. An interesting speculation, never to be proven, is a relationship between FitzGerald's early nightingale music and Henley's 'late lark singing.'

But although he thought so strangely much of the moral possibilities of his dialogue—'I published the little Dialogue,' he writes to W. F. Pollock, 'wishing to do

something as far as I could against a training system of which I had seen many bad effects'—as a piece of literature, it had no other critic of its literary quality so severe as himself. Even as he was writing it he had his misgivings. 'It is not easy,' he says to Cowell, 'to keep to good dialectic and yet keep up the disjected sway of natural conversation.' Plato's supreme art, he says, has been revealed to him by his attempt to copy it. In a far later year, looking through the little book with the idea of sending it to his American friend, J. R. Lowell, his courage fails, he finds it 'so pretty in Form, I think, and with some such pretty parts; but then some odious smart writing, which I had forgotten.' Smartness, what a journalist to-day would call 'snap,' was the deadliest sin in his eyes. He would have English as simple and unaffected as could be. He rebukes himself, in a letter to W. F. Pollock, for a very innocent and minor lapse from this standard, writing: 'Last night I was with some sailors at the Inn: some one came in who said there was a Schooner with five feet of water in her in the Roads; and off they went to see if anything beside water could be got out of her. But, as you say, one must not be epigrammatic or clever.' The simplicity he aimed at was very far from easy, as he well knew. He would have all superfluities pruned away and the meaning closely packed. 'Abridge, Concentrate, Distil,' were favourite words with him, says Mr Thomas Wright, and as we read FitzGerald we see the fruit of these similar yet slightly different processes.

I have spent time over the 'Euphranor' out of proportion to its literary value as judged by other work of his, because it throws so much light and such varied light on its author's uncommon character. There is a further characteristic which it brings out, and which I touched on before—his hero-worship. In 'Euphranor' the hero is an athlete, a good fellow who could ride and shoot, and do all the duties of a country squire and was as far remote as a good Philistine can and should be from the intellectual prig whom FitzGerald would almost seem to have found the common product of Cambridge University training. Under the name of Phiddipus, he had his original in E. F.G.'s young friend Browne.

In later life he made, more extravagantly still, a hero

of a fishing skipper of the East Coast. He was a fine figure of a man, like a Viking, FitzGerald says. He had what probably was a common Viking failing, a love of strong potions. FitzGerald cannot blind himself to this. But there were some curious financial transactions between them. They went halves in a fishing lugger, a venture which at first did not pay. Then it did pay, and at once the Viking hero, by nickname 'Posh,' wished to dissolve partnership. They had a row. Next day FitzGerald, after a sleepless night, was round early at Posh's house with a bottle of gin—of gin! and he had persuaded the Viking once to take the pledge, which he did not keep—told him he was quite right to wish to be independent and master of his own craft. But it is not to be conceived that any one ever had financial relations with FitzGerald without getting the better of him. He seems to have so asked to be taken in that it must have been hard to refuse him. Still the mode of life that he liked, and the only mode that he could endure, cost so little, and the fortune of the FitzGeralds, in spite of improvidence, unjust stewards and colliery disasters which brought his father to bankruptcy, was so large, that he never seems to have wanted badly for money.

Of neither of those two, Browne nor Posh, heroes of his own making, could he say or even hear a word of criticism. The real heroes, Tennyson and Thackeray, he could criticise, still worshipping, sharply enough. He was very humble about his own creative powers, but his letters show that he had no diffidence of himself at all as a critic, whether of literature, painting or music. There are men to whom friends are little and who might bear their loss lightly. We may conceive that it would have been no poignant aggravation of Job's griefs had all his three famous friends been taken from him. But there never was a man to whom friendship meant more than to FitzGerald, and never one with whom Death dealt more hardly in taking them away.

In 1859 he lost Browne, his Phiddipus, killed in a riding accident. In 1863 his beloved sister, Mrs Kerrich, died; and in the same year, prematurely aged, Thackeray, his friend since Cambridge days. In 1879 the other favourite sister, Andalusia, died; in 1881 both Carlyle and Spedding. He himself died in 1883, so of these last he

was not long bereft, but a full list of his early lost friends would be far longer than this.

Perhaps I might be suspected, from what I wrote of the strange figure that 'Old Fitz' would have cut in a gynasium, of going with the curiously current opinion of his laziness, the estimate of him as a very indolent man, drifting along the river of circumstance, plying no oar. It is largely to make a protest against that general opinion and profound error that I have written this paper. For the grounds of any general estimate we have to look at his life and what he did with it. We have so far seen him taking an unremarkable degree and making remarkable friends. Thereafter we would expect him to make choice of a profession. But there is no witness that he ever thought of such choice. Nor—which in any but the FitzGerald family we might think surprising—does his father, or even his masterful mother, seem to have suggested that he should.

So he stayed at home or with his married sister, Mrs Kerrich, and 'did nothing,' as is said. He went to Paris with Thackeray, he visited here and there, but generally he went on staying at home or in bachelor quarters near by, in this sense 'doing nothing' all his life. He did not earn five thousand, five hundred, I doubt whether he ever earned fifty pounds a year, yet, for all that, he worked and worked and worked all the time. He never took a holiday, or, if he did, he took with him his tools—his books or his sketching things, for he was a more than moderately good artist—perhaps a score of music to play over, for he played piano and organ and sang correctly with a true though not a strong voice. Last and less visibly, but of greatest importance of all, he took his thoughts. All idle trifling, agreeing with the *dolce far niente* label tacked on him by Carlyle, it may be said!

Yes, but before passing verdict may it not be well to look at what came out of this trifling, this day-dreaming—the output, or at least some of it? I make that qualification because there may have been much more, even of published work, than we know; for except the prose 'Euphranor' I believe the only things he signed were the translations, so to call them, of Calderon's plays. There may not have been much, however, for as late as 1880 he writes of an article in 'Temple Bar' as his first contribution to a

magazine. But besides what was published we may be quite sure that this very sensitive man, hypercritic of himself, wrote much which found its grave in his own waste-paper basket. We must assign much of his time and business to work that no one but himself ever saw.

But, these still-born creatures aside, see how large is his acknowledged progeny. There was 'The Meadows in Spring'—quite delightful!—and there were other less finished lyrics and elegies. He edited the verses of his friend and neighbour Bernard Barton, the Quaker, in 1849; published 'Euphranor' in 1851 and 'Polonius,' a collection of rather platitudinous wise sayings, a year later. He was strangely, as it may seem to us, attracted by the plays of Calderon, and went to the trouble of translating—in a sense—as many as eight in all into English verse. Six came out in 1853 and two more thirteen years later. His aim in all his many and varied translated pieces was to give, if he might, the original spirit. He disdained the letter. He altogether omits, as unfriendly to English ears, although agreeable to the then still half Moorish-Spanish ear, big slices of Calderon's bombast and turgidity.

It is about this same time of his greatest intellectual activity that his fancy turns to the East. It is in 1856 that he publishes his first Persian version: 'Salaman and Absal.' Three years later comes the first edition of Omar. He passed from the Spanish plays to very different dramatic scenes, the 'Ædipus' and 'Agamemnon,' yet he deals with such Titans as Sophocles and Æschylus with the same freedom as with Calderon. That was his way, and we may be grateful, for it was the way in which he was to deal with Omar, and had he dealt with the famous quatrains in any other fashion they could not have been the joy that they are. One might add many to this list, but it suffices—does it not?—to quash the charge of idleness. I think that no stone should be thrown at him except by one who is able to say that he has done more, and done better, and, leaving it so, FitzGerald's shade will not be badly pelted. Notice how all the great happenings of his life, of which it is the common thing to say that very little happened or was done at all, came at once—in a decade. From 'The Meadows in Spring' in 1831 until 'Euphranor' in 1851, we may say

that almost nothing happened. Then, within ten years or so, so much ! It is remarkable.

It is noticeable, too, that the literary happenings coincide with outward changes in his life. His great friend, Bernard Barton, died in 1849 ; two years later came his father's financial crash, followed by his death in 1852. The father had moved from Wherstead to Boulge, where Edward had lived with him, at first in the large house and later in a cottage which he had for his own use in the park. But now he found Boulge intolerable and went into lodgings with a farmer just outside Woodbridge. He seems to have liked lodgings, probably as less trouble than even the smallest house. He lodged in Woodbridge itself, in Lowestoft, in London. All he wanted was one room where he could live as untidily as he liked. The cooking he needed was of the simplest. Early in life he had become a vegetarian, though not of strictest sect, for he would eat the partridges that his friend Herman Biddell sent him.

In 1855 Mrs FitzGerald, the mother, died, and apparently some of her money came to him. The use he made of his better fortune was to marry Miss Barton, with whom there had been some kind of 'understanding,' as it is called, all the seven years since her father's death. I believe this is the one act of his life which he did against his wish, and its result must have confirmed his melancholy conviction that the best way in life for him was to do nothing. It turned out yet another FitzGeraldine blunder. Probably she was in love with him. Certainly he was not in love with her. Yet they made the great experiment with the best of will on both sides. His untidiness irked her, as her tidiness irked him. They tried life together for a few months, failed to make it a success, separated temporarily, came together to try again—for a few weeks only this time—failed again, and finally and honourably, he dealing with his usual generosity about the money. Of course this sad episode can be read in several of the books published about him and his writings since his death, but specially, and with highest authority, in the latest published, by Captain Barton, a relative of Mrs Edward FitzGerald.

The principal writings about him are the 'Letters and Literary Remains,' in three volumes, by W. Aldis

Wright in 1889; the 'Letters to Fanny Kemble,' edited by W. Aldis Wright, 1895; 'More Letters,' with the same editor, in 1901. The 'Life,' by John Glyde, in 1900, and the much fuller and more detailed 'Life' in two volumes by Mr Thomas Wright in 1904; 'Edward Fitzgerald,' by A. C. Benson, in the English Men of Letters series in 1905; and 'Some New Letters,' by Captain F. R. Barton, C.M.G., in 1923. These last are to this old Quaker friend, Bernard Barton, all therefore belonging to rather an early time of his life, for Barton died in 1849. He had lived at Woodbridge—lived there, as FitzGerald for all his haunting of its neighbourhood never did, like a limpet on a rock. He did not stir. One implication of which is that it is in absence from Woodbridge that Edward FitzGerald wrote these letters, whereas it is chiefly from Woodbridge that the others are written. Therefore they shed a constant light on what FitzGerald did while he was away.

Chiefly he went to lodge in London, to frequent picture-dealers' shops, and to hear music. Handel, as we might suppose, is, of composers, for him 'the king.' Occasionally he lapsed from that loyalty. Hearing Mozart's G Minor Symphony, after Handel's 'Alexander's Feast,' he writes, 'It seemed as if I had passed out of a land of savages into sweet civilised life.' But perhaps it is rather the theme than the composer that makes him say this. Middle-aged and lover of the past as he already was, and as he almost seems to have been born, no Jenny Lind or the like new-risen stars were comparable, in his view, with Pasta. More interesting is his picture criticism, and we may know something of the torment of Tantalus as we read of the prices which he named, and sometimes paid. He bought pictures for himself, and apparently was given a free hand, within modest limits, to buy for Barton and for another Woodbridge friend, himself a painter, Churchyard.

It was his habit to write once a week at the least to Barton. He buys Constables, Cromes, even a Titian—this last for himself—deeming ten pounds a very big price. It is true, he does write: 'Three doors off me is a Constable which is worth a journey from Woodbridge to London to see: it is a large one—of Salisbury Cathedral. It was bought at his sale for two hundred pounds, and the

owner adds a 100*l.* to its value every year, he tells me '—the date of the letter is 1841—' he now wants 600*l.* It is worth it; being as fine as Rubens'. It ought to be in the National Gallery.' Well, it is. Also we may agree that it is worth 600*l.* The comparison with Rubens is curious. We should like to hear E. F.G. further on that, for his criticism was worth hearing, and he did not spare it even from his beloved Constable. These three-figured prices were beyond the ambitions of the 'Wits of Woodbridge,' as the small circle in which FitzGerald went was nicknamed, probably by the good but slower-witted Suffolk squires from whom, though he was of like birth and breeding, E. F.G. had quite detached himself. Why, they dressed for dinner! That in itself would have been enough to detach him—the boredom of such unnecessary tying of ties and the rest!

In later letters we hear less of pictures. His means, for a while about the time of his father's failure and death, were straitened, though he never was 'in want,' because his needs were so small. Also he must, if he kept them, have had quite as many pictures as the scanty wall-space which he had could hang. Besides, it is from, not to, Woodbridge that nearly all the letters are—not London, where pictures are bought and sold. It is more of his reading that we hear now. There were the classics, the Spanish and the Persian that he begins to spell out, in 1850 or so, with help of dictionary and the spur of Professor Cowell. But he read much in English, too, both verse and prose, loving the earlier, deploring the later Tennyson, weeping repeated tears over 'The Lincolnshire Farmer' as he writes of it. He liked a story. He liked stirring stuff—he who stirred so little. Evelyn, to him, is 'colourless after dear Peepy.' For the lack of story, he could not abide Jane Austen—which is strange, for we should have thought his humour close akin to the immortal Jane's. He adored Scott. He actually travelled, a pious pilgrim, to Edinburgh and Abbotsford, to pay Scott his worship. He appreciated Thackeray, though there was a time, when 'Pendennis' was coming out, that he confessed to finding it 'dull.' Again and again he reads 'The Woman in White,' delighting in that great man and villain, Count Fosco. 'Far from the Madding Crowd,' he comments, is 'an incomprehensible novel.' But for

Dickens he cannot find words to say how high he should be put. Perhaps 'the Cockney Shakespeare' is his apotheosis. And then, again rather strangely, he loved certain of the French writers, in particular Madame de Sévigné.

At one time he had a warm cult for Wordsworth, but later grew a little colder by reason of something of the pedagogue withering the freshness of Wordsworth's Nature love. Charles Lamb, 'dear Charles Lamb' as he writes, he quite inevitably loved. At first he could make nothing, nothing sensible, of Carlyle. A 'quite insane book' he styles 'Heroes and Hero-Worship'; but later, when they became friends over the battlefield of Naseby, he appreciated the rugged sage, and, more remarkably, the regard was mutual—'the peaceable, affectionate, and ultra-modest man, and his innocent *far niente* life,' as Carlyle wrote of him to C. E. Norton. I take exception to the *far niente*. *Festina lente* strikes me as his better motto.

Often in that life of intellectual industry and bodily idleness his conscience smites him. He can always, at least, see the value to other men of using their vital energies. Even of Alfred Tennyson, whom he most loyally admired, he could write, to Mrs Kemble, 'If he had lived an active Life, as Scott and Shakespeare; or even ridden, shot, drunk and played the Devil, as Byron, he would have done much more and talked about it much less.' But of Byron his letters say curiously little. He can understand Trelawney liking Shelley, as a man, better than Byron, though of Shelley's poetry he writes: 'for a true Poet I recognise him: but too unsubstantial for me, and poor Keats's little finger worth all his body: not to mention Byron, with all his faults.' To W. F. Pollock he writes of 'an absurd article' comparing Tennyson with Browning . . . 'In Browning I could see little but Cockney Sublime, Cockney Energy.'

And about the letters—the incomparable letters! I say incomparable without giving him special rank on a competitive list, with, say, Lamb, Gray, Cowper, Byron. They are incomparable because there were no others just like them. If you read these letters, the majority of them that is, for some are rather different, and ask yourself how it was that FitzGerald composed them—his way of

going at them—you will conclude, I think, that he sat down with paper, pen and ink before him and in his mind knowledge of whom he meant to write to, no doubt, but very little more knowledge than that. They read as if his pen wandered along, penning the thoughts that came to his mind in no carefully formed manner. It was very much the manner in which his life was led. If he drifted, purposely letting himself drift, because he felt it was the best way for him (and the better way for all FitzGeralds if only they could have realised it), so too he let his letters drift upon the easy current of his thought. He talks about his garden, how the irises are coming up, about the birds, how he prefers—singular and almost impious heresy!—the blackbird, with his note of high cheer, to the nightingale—how his boat sailed, how his old cook-housekeeper is, how Ginger, his Skye-terrier, imagines and chases false rabbits—and so on 'till the cows come home.'

Why should the letter ever stop? There is no reason. And it is all suffused—you cannot say spiced, because that would imply *pique* in it of which there is none—with a delightful humour and fancy and whimsey. It is a charm not analysable. He does not—or rarely does—joke; but, as you read, you become aware of that comfortable feeling inside, rather as if your digestive processes were going on so extraordinarily comfortably as to be not merely painless but positively pleasurable, that only writing of this particular quality can give and which goes with an involuntary curving of the face muscles into a smile. It is that kind of humour—unquotable, indescribable. And a very delightful part of it all is FitzGerald's certainty—so certain that he does not need to tell you he is certain—that you are going to be interested in these things that interest him, Ginger, the cook, the irises. So he writes through the Crimean War, the Indian Mutiny, the Franco-German war of 1870, but you become, with him, a perfect Gallio about all these things. It is the flowers and the birds and the rest of it that matter. In one of the letters to Mrs Kemble he says roundly that he will not read about war. Much earlier he had written to Frederic Tennyson, 'I never see a paper,' but at one time we do find that he reads the Ipswich local paper. And about 1861 he was taking much interest in the Volunteers.

I have said that there were other kinds of letters, letters in which he had something special to talk about, but there again it was always about the things that were naturally in his mind—the books he had been reading, the pictures he had been seeing, perhaps buying, the music he had been hearing, and so on. Nor is there any doubt that Old Fitz, not readily putting himself out about anything, really would take more than a little trouble to do what a friend asked him. He went to a great deal of trouble for Carlyle, who seems to have taken quite a pleasure in the trouble he caused, to find out certain truths about the battlefield of Naseby. Carlyle was writing about Oliver Cromwell. He had written of the battle of Naseby, that it was fought around a certain obelisk which had been put up there. The obelisk builder was Edward FitzGerald's father, for the Naseby field was at one time his. Carlyle, told by Edward FitzGerald in the first place, I believe, that the big fighting took place not just where the obelisk stood, on the highest eminence, but somewhere near by, was furious. He objurgated that poor cairn and its builder—in letters to E. F.G., remember, whose father had built it—with Carlylean epithets which no son except E. F.G. would have tolerated about a father. It is a sign of a queer detachment, though without loss of affection, between that son and father that the son does not seem to have resented them in the least. On the contrary, he took all pains possible to oblige the cross-grained old grumbler, going up all the way to Naseby purposely, and digging in a field for bones and skulls, which he came on plenteously, of those fallen in battle, in order to identify the centre of the slaughter. He did not enjoy the job, but he did it thoroughly and sent bones to Chelsea for the sage to growl over.

I think that some of the very best because so typically FitzGeraldine letters are to his old Quaker friend, Barton. Mr Wright says that some of the best are to Frederic Tennyson. I might agree there, up to a point. But there came a moment, in 1844, when Frederic Tennyson was so extraordinarily ill-advised as to let FitzGerald know that he found his letters dull. FitzGerald writes about it—'What is a poor devil to do? You tell me quite truly that my letters have not two ideas in them—' so on, to the effect that Boulge—it does not sound as if it would—

inspires no ideas. And ever after this it seems as if he wrote to Frederic Tennyson with an effort—as though with a feeling in the back of his mind that his letters must not be dull. I seem to see some constraint, not quite the native wood notes in them. He tries to write *about* something.

Now a great part of the real FitzGeraldine charm is that he did write about nothing, that he was dull, in the sense of news-giving. When he wrote about something it was always something on which he had his own ideas, and no man ever was more individual and true to his own 'ghost,' as Chaucer would call it. He was a very fine critic of all forms of art, and for all his modesty about any little creative work that he tried, he was confident of himself in criticism. Therefore all that side of the voluminous correspondence is very good, but what makes the letters at large all that they are to us, and unlike any others, is that they are so essentially Songs of Innocence, childish prattlings. After all, Fitz was a middle-aged innocent to the end. Occasionally, very occasionally, he would allow himself a joke of the real 'laughing through a horse-collar' kind, and when he did it was a perfectly outrageous joke: 'Shovel-hats, you know' (for the Clergy), 'came in with the Gift of Tongs.' We must remember there was still a vogue for the *jeu de mot*. Puns had not then, as was said of damns long before, 'had their day.'

We might dally with the letters long, or we might pass them by after perusal of very few, and might know equally much of the writer, because that writer was singularly the same through all the years of writing. Mr Benson, it is true, does tell us that he finds the earlier letters to be 'statelier,' but I cannot say that their stateliness strikes me early rather than late. There is a quality of that kind about them which makes a very pleasant set-off to the whimsies, but both the whimsies and the state seem to me to be there all through. But always they make you feel that they were written not because the writer thought that his friends would love reading them, but because he loved writing them. I think he was of like mind with one who is surely a keen rival for the championship of English letters, William Cowper: 'There is a pleasure annexed to the communication of one's ideas, whether by

word of mouth or by letter, which nothing earthly can supply the place of.' They are letters which must have been penned leisurely, as FitzGerald would be sure to do, and the writer was plainly one with that high respect for the English language natural to a scholar of Dr Malkin of Bury, yet they are as far as possible from being elaborately thought-out letters, and occasionally he will allow himself such a fearful lapse as to write of 'these kind of places.'

Possibly this friendliness by post gave him even more constant satisfaction than the actual meeting of friends, because it could at will be taken up or laid aside, for we must realise that with his great gift for friendship went an equally great desire and need for solitude—to be let go his own way. It was largely on the rock of this need frustrated that his marriage venture made shipwreck. I think that is what he found so pleasant in a dog's company, that he need not listen to a dog's talk, or talk to him, any longer than he liked. Maybe so too with children, for he must have been a very perfect child-lover and child-understander. Probably he could be grumpy with them at times, but, after all, so could they with him, and perhaps a little mutual grumpiness now and then made them the closer. All his friends suffered from his 'grumps' at one time or other, but none failed, nevertheless, to bear warm witness to his loveliness—Thackeray, Carlyle, Alfred Tennyson and many more. But himself is best witness of all: who but a very lovable man would write this?—'Here I see my old friend Mrs Schutz and play with the children. Having shown the little girl the prints of Boz's Curiosity Shop, I have made a short abstract of Little Nelly's wandering, which interests her much, leaving out the Swivellers, etc. For children do not understand how merriment should intrude in a serious matter.' This Homeric 'Nelly-ad' is believed to be extant. Might it not be published even now, for Little Nelly is still loved, here and there in England, while in America she is worshipped everywhere?

At Geldeston Hall were nephews and nieces, children of the Kerrichs, and there must have been joy at the news that he was coming for a visit. This is how he writes from Geldeston to Bernard Barton in 1846: 'And now I must go out, for a covey of children with bonnets on are

waiting for Uncle Edward to take them to a great gravel pit in the middle of a fir-wood, where they may romp and slide down at pleasure. This is Saturday, and they may dirty stockings and frocks as much as they please.' What an uncle he must have made ! Exactly of their own age—for childhood, until the middle teens, has very much the same outlook as later middle-age—though with the never enough to be envied advantage over the rest of them that he might, and doubtless did, dirty his frocks as and when he pleased with no need to wait till washing day.

And there is Omar—late-comer in the tale of his books, yet of the first importance—for when we say 'Edward FitzGerald,' 'Omar' is first of the 'over-tones' suggested. With Omar's 'Rubaiyat,' a great poetic work, his name is inseparably bound. We may take it that FitzGerald's boyish friendship with the old Anglo-Indian, Major Moor, in the house full of Buddhas and so on, had made his mind a likely soil for any Oriental seed. The later sowing of that seed came from his friendship with E. B. Cowell, an Ipswich man by birth, and his neighbour in East Anglia, then Professor of Sanskrit at Cambridge. Cowell started and encouraged him in the learning of Persian and in study of the Persian poets. By the time that Cowell sent him 'Omar' he could stumble along with the aid of a Lexicon sufficiently to make, as he says of his 'Agamemnon,' if not a version, at least a perversion of the original, and that is all he wanted. Also we owe positive gratitude to that stumbling which brought him to one very glorious and tremendous 'howler.'

What Omar was and what his verses meant, does not matter to us here. A mystical sense has been read into them, as if the 'wine' and the rest of the pleasant things of sense were to be taken as symbols of spiritual things. But the scholars seem on the whole to misbelieve this, preferring to take Omar at something like his face value. That at its simplest is how FitzGerald takes him, though doubtless Omar writes as a protestant against the strictest sect of the Islamism of his day, much as the Preacher of Ecclesiastes, in our Bible, wrote against the ultra-orthodox Pharisees. FitzGerald did extraordinarily with the quatrains, and what he did is already so highly rated that there is nothing in the way of appreciation to add. But he had their stuff, their substance, given him.

He found them, a scattered confusion, in no order, with certain lines of thought running through the whole. He arranged them into some—even so, none too methodical—method. He introduced among them stanzas that he picked up elsewhere and deemed suitable; he embroidered on the original Eastern web. But the quatrains of Omar number some five hundred: FitzGerald's, even including some which are in his second edition only, are but a few over one hundred.

His selection was wise. He omitted most of the stanzas that are thrown out as missiles at the Sufis—the protestant maxims, as we may call them. They are wisely omitted because we have no great interest in that matter. And, partly we may suppose by reason of FitzGerald's own extreme delicacy and partly to spare the feelings of Victorian readers, he gives very little of the eulogy of the 'tulip-cheeked' and 'golden' girls, who are many and often on the original Eastern stage. The gist of the whole 'argument,' so to call a strung-together rosary of reflections, is that the intellectual quest of the future is vain; therefore, let us enjoy the present:

' I sent my Soul through the Invisible
Some letter of that After-life to spell,
And by and by my Soul return'd to me
And answer'd, " I myself am Heav'n and Hell." '

Therefore, 'take the cash and let the credit' (seeing that it is so very uncertain an asset) 'go.' That is what it is all about, set to enchanting, haunting words and rhythm.

Marvellous as it must seem in our eyes, the first edition of FitzGerald's Omar fell so flat that it was to be bought for a penny in the second-hand bookshops of Charing Cross Road. That pennyworth some one carried to Rossetti and Swinburne, and therewith began the making of the booklet's fortune. There was a reprint of the first edition in 1862, a second edition in 1868, a third in 1872, a fourth and final in 1879. As they came out FitzGerald kept altering and adding, and in most of the alterations, I think, bettering them. Not in all. My own preference is for the opening as it stood in the first edition, rather than as amended in the fourth, which runs:

'Wake! For the Sun, who scattered into flight
 The Stars before him from the Field of Night,
 Drives Night along with them from Heaven and strikes
 The Sultan's Turret with a Shaft of Light.'

In the first edition, this went, surely more vigorously, more dramatically :

'Awake! For Morning in the Bowl of Night
 Has flung the Stone that puts the Stars to Flight.
 And Lo! The Hunter of the East has caught
 The Sultan's Turret in a Noose of Light.'

There is one fine stanza, with a very noble thought in it, for which we might wish that FitzGerald had found place. It goes thus in Mr Justin McCarthy's translation : 'The temples of all the gods are places of praise. All chiming of bells, all hymns, are praise of the All-powerful—the pulpit, the church, the beads, the cross, are but symbols of the same homage to the same Lord.'

It may well be that FitzGerald's own mind was not quite open to admit such spacious thought as this. Although the materialism which came after Darwin had given his religious beliefs something of a shake, he was by upbringing, and always in practice, an Evangelical. His belief, if not quite firmly rock-based as before, might still forbid him to accept a tolerance so wide that it could easily seem to be indifference. But Omar in the version of FitzGerald has been too well and long discussed for words of mine to throw illumination on him. One word only I would say about the inspired 'howler' of Quatrain lxxxi. :

'Oh Thou, who Man of baser Earth did make
 And ev'n with Paradise devise the Snake :
 For all the Sin wherewith the Face of Man
 Is blacken'd—Man's forgiveness give—and take !'

'And take !' It is terrific. But how much of it is Omar, how much FitzGerald? Professor Cowell gives the answer : 'There is no original to the line about the snake : I have looked for it in vain in Nicolas' (the French Persian scholar and translator) ; 'but I have always supposed that the last line is FitzGerald's mistaken version of Quatrain 236 in Nicolas' ed. . . . FitzGerald mistook the meaning of giving and accepting as used here,

and so invented his last line out of his own mistake. I wrote to him about it when I was in Calcutta; but he never cared to alter it.' One would hope not indeed—if mistaken, then so splendid and so awful a mistake! The irony of it! It is curious to see in the 'Later Days of Thomas Hardy,' by his widow, that it was this verse, this mistake, which the dying novelist had read to him a very few hours before his death—rather terrible, really, that he should pass out with that almost Titanic blasphemy in his thought.

FitzGerald then must be immortal by reason of the lovely embroidery which he wrought on the Oriental ground, but he was not a great poet. The pious of the Omar Khayyam Club, if they have borne to read even as far as this, will perhaps bear to read no longer: they may be too deeply hurt. But I care not. Truth is, that not only for us, mere laymen without the pale, but even for the very élite of the Club sacred to the name of that Wise Man of the East, there is danger, in our reverence for all that FitzGerald did, of forgetting that ancient wisdom altogether. It has been written that Omar is dry as desert sand beside the green oasis of FitzGerald. Yet—I have no Persian, but reading the literal translations suffices to show this, if no more, that Omar thought at least as deeply as he drank, that the poetic feeling of the quatrains as we read them in the delicious words of FitzGerald was Omar's very own; FitzGerald has been his beautiful interpreter for us. For that we owe him gratitude beyond words. But the gratitude should not hypnotise us to loss of proportion and reasonable criticism.

When he came to write 'of his own'—those lyrics, 'The Meadows in Spring' and so on—he was a graceful poet indeed, but surely of the calibre of those who are properly styled 'minor.' And his translations from the Spanish and the Greek are good versifying: nor claim to be more. But the letters! If FitzGerald lovers have glowed with what they feel to be righteous indignation over these poor words of my criticism, I will, in hope to placate them, venture a little more rashly than I dared somewhat earlier in this paper: I will say that I put the letters first of all written in our tongue. It is difficult, as I then wrote, to rank them, because they do not fall strictly into rank with the others. They do not compare.

But for the comfort and the peace that they bring to us with their reading I know none to equal them, It is in thankfulness for that lovely ease that I place them first. So judging them, and remembering the beauty of the 'Euphranor,' I regret the time spent and, I think, comparatively wasted, on the verse versions of the Spanish and Greek plays. We could well spare them for more of the lovely and comfortable words of FitzGerald's prose.

Towards the end it was steadfastly Eastward that his soul's eye was set as he went shambling along the streets of Woodbridge, unobservant, remote, with brooding eyes under thick black brows, though the hair of his head was snowy white, a heavy-built man, for flesh had come on him with the years, most untidily dressed and most careless of opinion. The brooding and the doubts of Omar were in some sense his, for he too had 'sent his soul through the Invisible' and had received no certain answer of that quest. He had lived through the baffling days, as has been noted, when the world was tremblingly re-reading Genesis by that new and most alarming light cast upon it by Charles Darwin—the gentlest, and least disposed for an alarmist of men. FitzGerald did indeed keep his church-going habits and his evangelicism and his intense hate of the Oxford Movement within the Church, but not, we are obliged to think, with full assurance. It was in perfect peace that he passed to his end. He went on a visit to George Crabbe, at Merton Rectory. He was seventy-four and naturally tired after his journey, and so early to bed by ten o'clock. There he was found in the morning as if calmly sleeping. He had again 'sent his soul through the Invisible'—this time not to return.

HORACE G. HUTCHINSON.

Art. 7.—CONCERNING THE WOODCOCK.

AMONG British birds the woodcock occupies a unique position. Though apt to prove disappointing as a bird of sport, for that very reason, perhaps, it is still regarded as the most desirable unit upon the heterogeneous list that comprises the game-bag. Immemorial tradition, no doubt, plays a large part in the woodcock's popularity, for the bird is associated with the earliest records of British sport. The woodcock was rearing its young in many parts of this island centuries before the first pheasant quitted the banks of the ancient Phasis. It lived the same shy mysterious life in quiet English valleys when the booming of the bittern was a common sound upon its then extensive feeding-grounds. It haunted the interminable wastes of moorland, marsh, and mere in the distinguished company of the great bustard, the ruff, the reeve and the quail. It knew the cry of the English wolf and wild-cat, and was keenly sought by the ancient fowler with falcon upon wrist. The virgin forest, the vast wastes of marsh and moor have long since disappeared, and with the old conditions have gone most of the shy creatures that loved their solitudes. The great bustard has passed; the bittern's jealously guarded range is too circumscribed to be other than negligible; the ruffs and the reeves are making their last stand; but still to the harried, half-choked English Wild the woodcock comes in dark November, as he has come since time unknown, along the mysterious highways of the winds, his arrival unseen, unheralded, until proclaimed by the light, unmistakable winnowings of his wings as he rises from some birch spinney or alder tangle.

In the opinion of many naturalists, the woodcock cannot much longer maintain the unequal struggle against the ever-increasing dangers that beset its way when crossing or wintering in the British Isles, and to this belief the steady decline in its numerical status lends countenance. Actually, it stands in no immediate danger of extermination. There can be no doubt, however, that some measure of protection is necessary if the bird is to escape the fate of so many others. Its enemies have become far too numerous within recent years to allow it much chance of ultimate survival under existing

circumstances. The disintegration of large estates has robbed the woodcock of many invaluable sanctuaries, while the shot-gun army of small-holders and country youths, which has developed since the War, constitutes a new and formidable menace to game-birds generally. Strictly speaking, the woodcock is not a 'game-bird,' and the ordinary tenant farmer is within his legal rights in killing the bird upon any land that he occupies. No woodcock may legally be shot, however, except by holders of game certificates, and no tenant farmer may authorise an outsider to shoot the bird upon his land, unless the game-rights are included in his lease—a somewhat ambiguous position. A more or less general laxity exists upon this point, however, and I have known many farmers who, while scrupulously preserving pheasants or partridges in respect of agreements with their landlords, always regarded a woodcock as their lawful perquisite. Their argument was always the same. The woodcock is a 'bird of passage,' and, unless shot at first sight, may never be seen again. To leave it, therefore, seemed an idle proceeding from their point of view. Lack of a certificate is no deterrent nowadays, and to the modern village youth, with or without his ten-shilling licence, the woodcock, like everything else, is fair game. No species, however tenacious, could long survive such a state of affairs.

With lawless guns so many and excise officers so few, adequate protection could not be easily enforced, and, as seems inevitable in such cases, were a longer 'close season' imposed, it would be at the cost of the man who shoots legitimately. The law-breaker would disregard the new regulations even as he flouts those already in force, while the sportsman who observes the provisions of the Game Acts would as often as not merely be sparing birds for the poacher's benefit. Despite the obvious drawbacks, however, one would advocate the experiment, and suggest that the official curtain should fall upon woodcocks, as upon pheasants and partridges, with the entrance of February. This would at least provide some safeguard for the birds during the northward or spring migration, at the time when they are pairing. In their breeding-places they are already sufficiently protected by the nature of the countries they inhabit, but, needless to point out, protection for the birds in the far North is

useless if their wholesale destruction is permitted before they can reach that sanctuary.

After a long period of comparative scarcity, the early winter of 1928 was marked by a sudden incursion or 'wave' of woodcocks, which passed over the country, restocking many old and once favourite haunts of the species which had been abandoned, as some people feared, for ever. For this incursion there was no apparent reason, nothing abnormal having occurred to account for it. There had been no relaxation of persecution during the preceding seasons, nor had the weather conditions of hatching time been exceptionally favourable. It was just one of those curious occurrences which defy explanation, and the incident is not without recent precedent. The summer of 1925 was remarkable for an entirely unaccountable revival of partridges in certain parts of the country where, for various reasons, the stock had been reduced to a negligible minimum. I know of localities in which the birds reappeared in considerable numbers from an almost invisible source without anything in the shape of artificial help, and the recent autumn of 1930 has afforded yet another surprise. This has been the extraordinary abundance of hedgehogs, commented upon in various newspapers, and nowhere more apparent than in the West Country, where the species, harried almost out of existence by the rabbit-trappers, has long been regarded almost as a 'rarity.' More have been brought in to me by neighbours within the last few months than I have seen for many years, while trappers are unanimous in their accounts of the astonishing numbers caught. This has coincided, curiously enough, with the revival of the landrail, which only a season or two ago was declared 'virtually extinct' by certain ornithologists, and nobody as yet has suggested a convincing reason for their disappearance or for their return. It too frequently happens that an abnormal wave of animal life precedes a corresponding decline, for the reason that the unusual abundance merely provides a greater incentive to indiscriminate slaughter. One hopes that history will not repeat itself in the woodcock's case, although the extreme scarcity of the birds up to the end of November was not reassuring.

A great deal has been written about the migrating

habits of woodcocks; of the first and second 'flights' that reach these shores; of the 'woodcock moon,' and the keenly anticipated 'black nor'-easter,' which conveniently brings the wide voyagers across the North Sea from their cold, lone breeding-places along the Arctic Circle. Numerous theories have been advanced. The woodcock, however, is a confirmed upsetter of theories, and none appear to stand the test of life-long experience. After many seasons during which one has studied the strange bird in its coming and goings, the only real discovery made is the extremely limited extent of one's own knowledge. For my part I have come to the conclusion that very little is actually known of the influences that govern the woodcock's southward 'drift.' As often as not, the chill northerly gale which is supposed to yield a full influx of the birds brings nothing but a tang of frost to start the last oak leaves upon their desultory course through the woods, and as for the 'hazy hunter's moon,' which, conventionally, should light the main flights across the wild seas, year after year it wastes its radiance upon empty sky and ocean, so far as the wayward woodcock is concerned.

It does not follow that favourable winds are not appreciated by, and even necessary to, the birds upon their long southward journey. A strong north-easterly gale is not, however, the incentive to migration that common supposition would have us believe. Migration may be delayed by adverse winds, but it does not appear to be hastened by favourable conditions. Until the time is ripe, or, in other words, until the northern marshes are finally sealed up and life for insectivorous birds becomes no longer possible, the woodcock is faithful to its native solitudes, and strong indeed must be the gale that wafts him southwards. How tenacious the birds are in deferring migration to the last possible moment is proved by their emaciated condition upon arrival, unmistakable testimony of hard times in the lands from which they come. Rightly or wrongly, I have come to the conclusion that the so-called 'early flight' never takes place, the woodcocks sometimes flushed in early October being in truth native birds, wandering about the country in obedience to the nomadic instincts that form so large a part of woodcock nature.

The unequal distribution of bird-life generally in this island is another curious circumstance for which there seems to be no satisfactory explanation. Of this the woodcock provides a noteworthy example, and it might be remarked that the author of 'Ten Years of Game-Keeping' barely mentions the species, merely referring to it as 'local and fickle.' Most remarkable perhaps is its abundance along the Atlantic seaboard, particularly in the Cornish Peninsula and Southern Ireland. Even now I know of at least one farm in the Hartland district where thirty or forty woodcocks may be flushed in the course of a day's rough shooting, and the same applies to many localities in the south-west. The old and generally accepted explanation of this circumstance is expressed in the following characteristic passage by Selby:

'The direction taken by such a great and successive column of these birds under migration from the north to the southern parts of Europe and northern Africa being in a great measure intersected by the south-western coasts of England and Ireland, accounts for the abundance of them in Devonshire and Cornwall, and the countries thus situated, and the still greater numbers found in the southern and western districts of Ireland, compared with the other parts of the kingdom.'

The theory, however, does not bear close inspection. It is difficult to see how the districts named 'intersect' the direct line of migration from Scandinavia over and above other localities. On the contrary, migrants must necessarily traverse the entire width of England before reaching these areas, nor is there any apparent reason why birds journeying to our shores from Norway should first alight upon the Atlantic side unless Einstein's theory that a straight line does not necessarily represent the shortest distance between two points applies also to birds upon migration. One might suggest a far simpler reason to account for the woodcock's unquestionable partiality for the south-west. South-west being its natural line of migration, it gravitates automatically in that direction when pursuing its erratic course across this island. Deterred from further progress by the barrier of ocean, which few birds face willingly, it lingers among the deep coombes and brakes so characteristic of Devon and

Cornwall, a large number of birds merely wandering from covert to covert for the greater part of the winter, while the bolder-spirited continue the equatorial movement.

With the possible exception of the landrail, there is no bird that takes wing more reluctantly than the woodcock. Whenever possible, he prefers the earth to the air, and it is, therefore, the more curious that so unwilling and indifferent a flier should, alone of its kind, perform the altogether unaccountable feat of transporting its young chicks through space. I have for some while been endeavouring to trace the origin of this now generally accepted idea, but, apart from the fact that it found credence among the earliest writers and was discredited by naturalists of a later date, I have been unable to trace its source. The controversy upon this subject is keener than ever at the moment. It is worthy of remark, however, that despite the statements of numerous witnesses, the fundamental question as to whether the bird does or does not actually carry its young is still referred to as 'problematic.' One treads upon delicate ground when approaching the point at issue. Those who have actually witnessed the phenomenon not unnaturally resent the incredulity displayed at times by the less fortunate. Bare justice, on the other hand, compels the admission that the 'conscientious objections' of the unconvinced—not necessarily based upon jealous or uncompromising scepticism—are wont to bear a disquieting resemblance to common sense, when faced without acrimony. It is true that the honest testimony of any individual should amount to proof positive. Equally true, however, is the counter assertion that every old and erroneous theory, now discredited, was originally supported by evidence as unimpeachable. One has only to cite the amazing case—it can be described as nothing else—of Gilbert White's hibernating swallows, which point was obviously established, at least to his own satisfaction, by the observant and level-headed incumbent of Selborne.

One need not, however, return to the eighteenth century for examples of 'reliable mistakes.' A year or so ago, being anxious to obtain photographs of young buzzards, I was scouring the neighbourhood in search of new eyries, accompanied by an eminent ornithologist

generally recognised as one of the most accurate and conscientious observers of the day. We found a nest in a decidedly awkward position, and being anxious before undertaking the difficult ascent to discover whether it was inhabited, my companion mounted an eminence close by, from which, with the aid of a field-glass, every detail of the eyrie was clearly visible. Returning after a careful inspection, he declared without the slightest doubt or hesitation that he could plainly distinguish the bird upon the nest, and we were encouraged to proceed. Upon investigation, however, the nest proved to be a derelict, tenanted only by dry leaves which showed not the slightest sign of recent occupation. In view of numerous similar examples, the much-abused but not necessarily unintelligent sceptic cannot be justly blamed for wondering how big a part *imagination* has played in many of the recorded instances in the woodcock's case. It is not within human nature to doubt the testimony of one's own eyes. At the same time, no open-minded person can question the almost universal tendency to see anything that one expects or wishes to see. Imagination, quickened by desire or interest, frequently plays curious tricks. One need only recall the autumn of 1914 and the supposed passage of Russian troops through this country. There was scarcely a railway official who would not have testified—upon oath if required—to having recognised the Czar's uniform in numerous southward-bound troop trains. Recollections of statements made upon this head must cause mental discomfort to many people even to-day. With precedent so entirely upon his side, any man who sees reason for respectful incredulity is, therefore, justified in maintaining that attitude until all possibility of mistake has been removed.

Personally, I hold no brief for either side in the argument; but, like many others who cannot claim the distinction of having witnessed this interesting performance of the woodcock, I am puzzled by the conflicting nature of the 'evidence.' It might be worth while to compare some of the statements that have been made, from an unbiassed point of view. I cannot perhaps do better than insert these accounts verbatim, beginning with an extract from the work of the late Rev. G. M. A. Hewett,

which Mrs Hewett kindly forwarded to me not long ago. Taken from a Nature book for boys, it reads as follows :

'People have written a great deal about the way in which they (woodcocks) carry their young. There may be many ways, but I am sure of one, for I could have twice touched them with my stick. The first time Master Woodcock fancied his own flying powers, but his Ma wouldn't let him try. She swooped on him and knocked him down, and plainly and visibly tried to clutch him, neither with beak nor feet, but with her wing. . . . Some years afterwards I disturbed quite a tiny one, and the mother again came and took it under her wing and flew off with it, almost from under my feet, and I saw its head peep out where her wing joins her body.'

Reverting to earlier writers, Scopoli in his *Annus Primus Historico-Naturalis* states : 'Pullos rostro portat fugiens ab hoste.' Following this reference to the 'beak theory' as a means of transport, Buffon informs us that : 'They sometimes take a weak one under their throat and convey it more than a thousand paces,' while in the Ninth Edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* we find the following :

'A still more interesting matter in relation to the breeding of woodcocks is the fact, asserted by several ancient writers, but for long doubted if not disbelieved, and yet finally established upon good evidence, that the old birds transport their newly-hatched offspring, presumably to places where food is more accessible. The young are clasped between the thighs of the parent, whose legs hang down during the operation, while the bill is to some extent, possibly only at starting, brought into operation to assist in adjusting the load, if not in bearing it through the air.'

A footnote referring to the above extract affirms that 'Sir R. Payne-Gallwey, in the "Badminton Library,"* states that he has witnessed the performance.' Again, in the 'Museum of Animated Nature' it is asserted upon the authority of Fairholm that 'Woodcocks have been known, when apprehensive of immediate danger, to carry off in their claws both the young and their eggs.' A footnote to the same article adds :

'In the New Forest, in the year 1850, I came upon a female woodcock watering her three young ones at a rivulet.

* 'Shooting,' II, p. 118, note.

She picked up one in each claw and flew off with them. I hid in a high gorse-brake close by and saw her return in four or five minutes and pick up the remaining bird, also in her claw.'

Turning to modern authorities, Thorburn writes :

'It has long been known that the woodcock will take up and carry off its young when in danger, but opinions differ as to how exactly the chick is held, for as the mother usually depresses and spreads her tail as she flies directly away from the observer, this serves as a screen, but having seen the act, I believe that the chick is placed between the legs of the parent, clasped by the feet and held close to the body. In the same way the young are often taken to their feeding-grounds in the evening. Mr J. H. Dixon tells me that he has frequently seen this happen in Ross-shire, where the old birds would carry their burden across a fairly wide river on summer evenings.'

And, coming to the immediate present, in a recent issue of the 'Shooting Times,' F. H. L. expresses this view :

'I believe with Mr Sharpe, Mr Storey, and others that the feet are used and not the thighs. Indeed, it is quite logical to suppose that the feet would be used. After all, although the case is somewhat different, the raptorial birds use their feet for carrying their prey, and there seems to be no reason why the woodcock should bother about its thighs when its feet are quite well adapted for the purpose.'

This suggestion strikes me as the most probable, or, rather, as the least improbable of the many theories advanced, but in that case how does one account for the emphatic assertions of all the people who have seen entirely different methods employed? Those who claim to have seen a young woodcock borne aloft in its mother's unwieldy and mobile bill are quite as positive upon the point as others who support the thigh, wing, or feet theory. What inference, therefore, is to be drawn? Are all the observers right, or are they all wrong? Are some right and some in error? And if the latter, how is one to discriminate? It should be emphasised, moreover, that assuming all to be correct, the woodcock has not been given full credit for its amazing ingenuity and versatility. The inevitable effect of conflicting statements is to render the entire case unconvincing, the more so, since one cannot help noticing that supporters of any

particular idea have no hesitation in discrediting assertions which, if accepted, would tend to disprove their point of view. Since all are human, the unprejudiced onlooker cannot but wonder whether common error is not at the root of the difference.

This same difference of opinion is not confined to the actual methods that the woodcock employs. When the question of motive arises, one is confronted with the same difficulty. While the majority of ornithologists admit that the bird snatches up and flies away with a chick when menaced by some sudden danger, there appears to be a tendency to repudiate the old stock idea of the woodcock conveying its brood to and from the feeding-grounds. Here, again, there follows the problem of the numerous observers who claim to have witnessed this performance. It is true that the woodcock is under no necessity to do anything of the kind; but if all the evidence is to be subjected to the stringent test of probability, the whole idea might be dismissed off-hand as being inconsistent with avian instincts and procedure generally. There can be no doubt that the woodcock is neither physically nor temperamentally fitted for the part assigned to it, and this unique habit can only be attributed to some abnormal and unaccountable 'freak' instinct, the most remarkable feature of which is its apparent uselessness. For protective purposes, its uselessness is obvious. When in actual danger, the carrying-off of one chick can be of little profit to the remaining three. They must be clearly left to the mercy of the enemy, whether man, bird or beast; for in the sudden exigencies of woodland life tragedy strikes swiftly, and under no conceivable circumstances would the bird have time to return and remove another before the threatened fate had overtaken them. This is remarkable, for, as an almost invariable rule, an instinct provides for the safety of the many rather than of a negligible minority.

The woodcock, indeed, may be considered unfortunate in possessing such a habit, and might well envy the methods adopted by other ground-breeding species. The game-bird employs no such foolish tactics. While the partridge and the red grouse have recourse to their immemorial but curiously effective artifices, or the wild pheasant and capercaillie boldly confront the intruder,

compelling rather than attracting attention to themselves, the callow chicks are quietly trickling away into the undergrowth, amongst which no eye and few noses can detect them. There one sees a protective instinct, more rational and infinitely more serviceable than the fantastic trick ascribed to the woodcock. The curlew, the whimbrel, the lapwing and the landrail have all discovered equally effective means of baffling their enemies, and, apart from the psychological side of the question, it seems curious that the woodcock, alone of the feathered race, should have acquired a habit so un-bird-like and so purposeless.

Theoretically, the idea of the woodcock conveying its brood to and from the feeding-grounds is less incomprehensible. Wearisome as the proceeding could not fail to be, the object is at least clear. Here again, however, it must be admitted that cold logic suggests inevitable objections. If the marshes are at a distance—as they would be to render such a course of action necessary—the parent's task must obviously be no light one. If, on the other hand, the distance is negligible, it is difficult to see why the young birds, being such nimble runners, cannot accomplish the journey upon their own legs—a far safer, more comfortable and less laborious arrangement, particularly in view of the woodcock's confirmed pedestrian tendencies. The young of other wading birds, such as the curlew or green plover, must frequently cover considerable distances unaided. Again, the woodcock's necessity for undertaking the journey at all is not clear. At the time of year when the chicks are hatched, food can scarcely fail to be abundant all around them. Small earthworms, slugs, and grubs of every description are very near the surface of the ground. Ditches and runnels are drying out, leaving ample rims of soft mud. Leaf-drifts are still moist under, and rich with slimy life, and one cannot help thinking that the woodcock who takes her family for nightly rides gives herself a great deal of avoidable trouble.

There is yet another point upon which observers differ, some asserting that the woodcock is only capable of carrying a very young chick, while one eminent authority declares positively that half-grown fledglings are not exempt from such maternal attentions. From a

purely practical standpoint this latter assertion is interesting, since one has only to imagine the proceeding in order to realise its extreme difficulty. In such cases the use of the feet for the purpose would obviously be impossible, and under any circumstances, the entire question of practicability is a point upon which one hesitates to express an opinion. In this connection, the *raptores*, frequently quoted as examples, are an entirely different case. Their feet are designed for seizing and carrying, and these birds, it should be emphasised, are clumsy pedestrians. The feet of the woodcock, on the contrary, are clearly constructed for walking and running, and it seems incongruous to imagine them turned to any other use. Even the *raptores* make no attempt to carry their young under any circumstances, although the hen harrier, curiously enough, has been accused of removing its eggs upon occasions. This, I think, will be news to most naturalists.

Returning to the controversy for the last time, one might call attention to one or two possibilities that appear to have been overlooked. It is more or less generally admitted that a clear impression of the proceeding is seldom obtained, and in this circumstance the solution of the riddle may perhaps be found. In the case of birds flying at dusk, a definite or accurate impression is obviously impossible, and evidence obtained under such circumstances can scarcely be recognised as trustworthy. With regard to those flushed by daylight, the case is different, and it is with such instances that one is most concerned. On these occasions, observers are almost unanimous in declaring that the bird baffles the eye by the manner of her flight, so that they cannot see precisely how the chick is carried. In that case one naturally wonders how they can be certain that it is there, for if they cannot distinguish the parent's limbs, it seems improbable that they could identify the far less distinct outline of the little bird. Keen indeed must be the eye that can discriminate between the downy chick and a brown leaf, a wisp of bracken, or any of the numberless things that might adhere to the parent bird's plumage in its sudden and startled ascent. Is the whole proceeding, one wonders, a piece of clever jugglery, after all, on the part of the mother woodcock? Does she, when alarmed, swoop

upon the little one that is nearest to the danger, and with flurry of wing disguise its line of retreat, at the same time diverting the intruder's attention to herself? Such a course of action would be much more consistent with bird nature and not without parallel in the Wild.

In conclusion, one would venture to suggest that the time has come for settling this vexed question finally and indisputably. It should not be difficult with the facilities now at the disposal of field ornithologists. The woodcock is a bird that observes an almost clockwork regularity in its habits. Its nightly departure for the marshes can be timed almost to a minute. It should, therefore, only be a matter of selecting a favourite breeding-place, taking careful note of the lines of flight, and instituting a close and continuous watch, with the aid of photography when possible, or even the use of nets should all other means fail. Less difficult things are now accomplished almost daily, according to the film-producers, and one makes this suggestion in the hope that before another nesting season is past, some bird society, or private individual duly authorised, may be prevailed upon to undertake the experiment.

DOUGLAS GORDON.

Art. 8.—FRENCH PRIVATEERS AND SCOTTISH JACOBITES.

By no means the least interesting episode in the history of the French privateers is that of their relations with the Jacobites. The long-standing friendship between their country and Scotland, as well as the religion they held in common, undoubtedly helped to keep alive the hopes of the unhappy House of Stuart, and planted a thorn in the side of England for the greater part of a century ; but in few instances did the Jacobite sympathies of the French privateers themselves extend beyond their own pockets—to embrace the cause offered opportunities of action and gain ; and that was all.

During the late autumn of 1688, half a dozen small boats from Dunkerque, commanded by privateer captains or by junior naval officers, were detailed to cruise in the Channel and give information of the approach of the fleet with which William of Orange was setting out for England. Even the most fragmentary news was conveyed post-haste to Versailles ; but to the inhabitants of Dunkerque the arrival of the fleet threatened a special disaster, since it was rumoured that William proposed to make a raid on the corsair city of Flanders, and to sink four old ships filled with cement at the entrance to its harbour—in short, to put it out of action until he had occupied, and made himself secure upon, the English throne. The harbour of Boulogne at that period was badly choked by sand and inaccessible to vessels of any size. With Dunkerque also blocked, the mouth of the Thames would be safe and communication between London and Holland reasonably free from molestation. Timely warning, however, had been given to the authorities. William's seventy vessels, sailing in a long and straggling line down the Channel, passed the port without altering their course ; the six small French boats dogged them from a safe distance almost as far as Torbay, and then returned home. With every nerve taut, France watched the white cliffs on the western horizon.

Less than a month afterwards, a privateer named Grosbois received orders to man his lugger, the ' Rieuse,' with five naval officers and thirty of the best sailors he could find in port, to cruise off Gravesend, and to cover the

flight of the English Queen and the six-months-old Prince of Wales. At Christmas came news of the intercepted flight of James himself, quickly followed by his removal to Rochester. Another privateer, Jean Doublet, a native of Honfleur but sailing from Dunkerque, was instructed to embark a naval ensign, Vaux-Mimars by name, on board his sloop, the 'Princesse-de-Conti,' and to render all the aid in his power to the flying monarch. Away he sailed to the Downs in a gale of wind; landed, and at the first inn demanded news. The King, he learned, had already fled. Hurrying to the shore again, he boarded the 'Princesse-de-Conti' and returned to France.

Meanwhile, James had made his melodramatic escape by the garden at Rochester, had boarded the fireship 'Eagle,' and, together with her commander, Captain Trevanion, and the King's illegitimate son, the Duke of Berwick, had gone from her to a smack which, owing to the gale, was compelled to lie under the Essex shore until the wind moderated. The next day, they hoisted sail before sunrise. The King and Berwick sat miserably in the cramped little cabin, in constant fear of being attacked and recaptured; the ground-swell, which was the relief of the gale, made the voyage unpleasant, and snow showers added to the general depression. 'However,' we learn, 'it was of some cause of mirth to him [James], when growing very hungry and dry, Captain Trevanion went to fry His Majesty some bacon, but by misfortune, the frying-pan having a hole in it, he was forced to stop it with a pitched rag, and to tie an old furred can about with a cord and make it hold the drink they put in it; however, the King never ate or drank more heartily in his life.'

The 'Princesse-de-Conti' made Ambleteuse during the afternoon of Christmas Day; but no sooner had Doublet and Vaux-Mimars landed, than an English smack appeared, came close inshore, and cast anchor. A man, richly clad and bare-headed, lowered himself into the water and, taking on his back a passenger in sombre clothing—to whom, nevertheless, every one present on board the smack paid the greatest respect—began to carry him towards the beach. The two Frenchmen took in the situation at a glance; wading into the breakers beyond their thighs, they supported the pick-a-back King James one on either hand until he was safe upon dry land.

There he dismounted, thanked them for their aid, made his way to an inn, and went to bed. A few hours later, he was in the saddle for Paris.

France had declared war on the Dutch at the end of 1688, thinking, no doubt, that William's pre-occupation with affairs across the Channel would prevent his offering effective resistance: she could not foresee how rapidly he was to accomplish his purpose. Half-way through the following year she added England to her enemies, with her avowed intention, among others, of restoring the exiled Stuart to his lost throne. In the autumn, James himself took the field by landing at Kinsale with six thousand men. A French fleet overcame the English and Dutch off Beachy Head; but the Royal defeat on the Boyne put an end, for the time being, to Stuart hopes. A disappointed man, James re-embarked for France during the summer of 1690, and settled down at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. He was, however, not idle. France had always sheltered many Scottish and Irish subjects, among them being a number of seamen who had hitherto sailed under the French flag. Immediately on his return, therefore, James began to issue Letters of Marque; Louis signified his willingness to lend such ships as might be asked of him upon terms favourable to his Royal pensioner, and decreed that such prizes as the Jacobite privateers might bring into French ports should be subject to the same procedure of valuation and sale as those of the French corsairs, while the dues payable on them should accrue to James. Within a few months, a number of Jacobite captains had been registered at Dunkerque, Boulogne, and Saint-Malo—such names as Robert Dunbar, Anthony FitzGerald, Patrick Lambert, and the Geraldines, leave no doubt as to their nationality—and, with crews composed almost entirely of Scots or Irish, scoured the Channel to the discomfiture of British and neutral shipping. The most eager of them, however, as readers of the 'Waverley Novels' will know, made their way to Scotland in small merchantmen laden with commodities peculiarly dear to the Scottish heart. Carrying false passports, and under cover of trading, they delivered letters to Scottish enthusiasts for the cause, distributed propagandist pamphlets among the villages along the coast, and brought back information as to the state of feeling in the country.

Both they and their French confrères were also intimately concerned in the stirring episode of the Bass Rock, at the entrance to the Firth of Forth. In the middle of 1691, this bare and barren islet, formidable on account of the dungeons its castle contained, was seized by four young Jacobite prisoners under Lord Middleton. With reinforcements no more than twelve in number, and in the teeth of the many forces sent against them by William III, they continued to hold the Rock for nearly three years. From Dunkerque they drew their food supplies and munitions, in the following manner. Doublet was employed in landing arms on the Rock ; but having at another point put ashore a Jacobite passenger and a sealed dispatch addressed to the Duke of Gordon, he was attacked with such violence that it was only with difficulty that he escaped, leaving all his personal and official papers in the hands of the authorities at Leith. In 1692, Jean Bart, the famous corsair of Dunkerque, was instructed to furnish the garrison of the Rock with arms, munitions, and money, and then to land farther along the coast a group of important Jacobite officers ; but at the last minute the order was countermanded. It is instructive to note in passing that Bart seems to have been better informed as to English naval dispositions in the Firth of Forth than were the French Admiralty ; to their vague estimates of the opposition he was likely to encounter on the voyage, he replied with a list naming every enemy ship cruising in those waters, as well as of the Dutch vessels still in port but about to relieve them.

In spite of an English resistance increasingly severe, therefore, Jacobite and French privateers persisted in their efforts to supply the means of defence and livelihood to the gallant little band of enthusiasts on the Bass Rock ; while the band supported the seamen when, driven hard by pursuers, they took shelter under the lee of the islet. But in 1694, Robert Dunbar, laden with a cargo of food-stuffs, found his customary signals answered by a gunfire obviously hostile ; for on the previous night, Lord Middleton and his followers, at the end of their resources, had been forced to surrender, though on honourable terms.

The battle of Beachy Head had given France a sensible advantage at sea over her enemies ; and Louis,

imagining that he at last possessed the command of the ocean, determined, in 1692, upon an invasion of England on James's behalf. An army was formed in Brittany, and a fleet of fifty sail, under the Count de Tourville, the victor of Beachy Head, concentrated at Brest to protect its transportation—incidentally it may be mentioned that Bart's frigate, the 'Glorieux,' was among its numbers. But as the fleet went a-cruising, it was descried from the cliffs at Portland. On the following morning, an immense Anglo-Dutch fleet—ninety vessels, all told, under the Jacobite Admiral Russell—stood out to give battle. For four days one of the greatest sea-fights of modern times raged in the Channel; the French forces were scattered, partly by superiority of numbers, partly by contrary winds; a dozen French line-of-battle ships took refuge in the shallow roadstead of la Hogue, off the Cotentin peninsula, and were there destroyed piecemeal by English boats' crews under the very eyes of the expectant James. 'I have no command over the elements and can reproach myself with nothing,' declared Louis when news of the disaster was brought him. 'I did what I could; God has done the rest. Since He has not willed the restoration of the King of England, we can only hope that He reserves it for another time.'

Now that the fleet was out of action, the part played by the privateers increased in importance. Their industry was immense. Bart, who had escaped from la Hogue with a whole skin, undertook voyages of reconnaissance and of privateering pure and simple, of which James reaped the benefit. The nineteen-year-old Duguay-Trouin of Saint-Malo found himself engaged upon a secret mission for the ex-King. He was in command of the 18-gun 'Coëtquen,' accompanied by an Irishman of the widespread family of Walsh. His destination is not now known; but having completed the task set him, he fell in with an English merchant fleet escorted by two men-of-war. Such a chance was not to be missed. Promptly he and Walsh attacked, and succeeded in carrying off five of the English ships. Walsh and the prizes made Saint-Malo in safety, but Duguay-Trouin, chased by a small English squadron, found his retreat cut off and only the dangerous waters of the Ile de Bréhat, off Paimpol, open to him. In them he dropped

anchor, the English ships nearly coming to grief in their attempts to follow ; but when he tried to leave his anchorage, with his pilot killed and every officer familiar with the locality wounded, he found himself sorely beset by the half-submerged reefs and treacherous currents of the little strait—indeed, only by a skill in navigation far beyond his years did he contrive to make his escape into the Channel. Within a few days he experienced another adventure when, driven by a storm under the lee of Lundy Island, in the Bristol Channel, he saw an English ship of 60 guns making for the same shelter. As the Englishman came in on one side of the island, Duguay-Trouin cut his cable and slipped out at the other.

But to describe all the activities of the French and Jacobite privateers during this period would be to write a history of the naval side of the War of the League of Augsburg—that they were indefatigable and the cause of constant embarrassment to English shipping is shown by our assiduity in bombarding Saint-Malo, le Havre, Dieppe, Dunkerque, and other of their ports of refuge. In 1696, moreover, Louis determined upon another attempt at invading England, with Calais as his base ; but having this time no fleet to help him, he intrusted Bart to fit out at Dunkerque a squadron of seven ships to cover the landing. A hundred and fifty fishing-boats were commandeered for the transport of troops under Marshal de Boufflers, and every corsair vessel obtainable was pressed into service. At the beginning of March James arrived at Calais, and inspected the expeditionary force, part of which was already lying off Gravelines ; he was about to step on board when information was brought him that the English and Dutch were concentrating, in the Downs and at the mouth of the Thames, a fleet of overwhelming numerical superiority. To risk another disaster was no part of the plan of James or of Louis ; there was nothing for it but to disband the force and to return disconsolate to Saint-Germain. Never again during the lifetime of the exiled King was an attempt made to recapture his lost throne. By the Peace of Ryswick, in the following year, Louis pledged himself to abandon the Stuart cause—a pledge which, as will be seen, he made no effort to keep. In 1701 James died, in his sixty-eighth year, leaving his son, the Old Pretender, as the Jacobite hope.

Yet, though James was dead, Jacobitism was lively enough in the French Channel ports, as also at Versailles, its mainspring being still the ex-subjects of the dead King and the shadow-subjects of his successor. Many glimpses of Jacobite activity among the common people are to be found in the archives of the early eighteenth-century police along the coasts of Brittany. For it was in such ports as Saint-Malo, Saint-Brieuc, Paimpol, and Morlaix, and such inland towns as Dinan, that Irish Jacobites settled in large numbers, many of them opening taverns and drinking dens of a sort to give the authorities perpetual anxiety. At Morlaix, for instance, the police were constantly on the track of a certain Thomas Martin, whose inn, 'À la Harpe Couronnée,' was no better than a brothel; at Saint-Malo a woman named Batteler kept a similar house, 'À la Belle Viande'; at Dinan, Brian Macdonagh and his wife, Mary Murphy, were under suspicion of being concerned in shady financial transactions; and all, honest or dishonest, poured, we may be certain, a good deal of Jacobite propaganda into the wine they served to British sailors whose ignorance of French drove them to patronise English-speaking houses.

At Saint-Malo the inn, otherwise of good repute, kept by Margaret Collins—*la belle Anglaise*, as she was called—rose to local notoriety owing to its injudicious proselytism. A police officer named Vasselin, making his usual rounds one night, saw lights in the inn long after the premises should have been closed. Entering the room, he found an Englishman and three Irishmen, each with a glass before him. The Englishman drank to the health of King George, who had come to the throne about a month previously; but the ringleader of the Irishmen insisted upon drinking confusion to the new monarch, and would take no denial. Words were beginning to run high when the fair innkeeper noticed Vasselin in the doorway, and, crying in a loud voice that she would serve no more that evening, bundled them into the streets and extinguished the lights. Vasselin then appears to have joined the quartette and to have accepted numerous drinks, while they discussed religion and politics, though 'without the least bitterness.' It was, indeed, nearly three o'clock in the morning before he parted from them.

Barely an hour and a half later, a young girl passing

along the ramparts was startled by the sound of running feet, followed by a clash of steel. Suddenly she heard an agonised cry ; from the ramparts there fell the body of a man with a sword still in his hand ; a second man, also armed, could be seen restrained by two companions. The girl shrieked ; the guard turned out ; the surviving duellist—he was the Englishman—found himself arrested, imprisoned, in due course condemned to be hanged, but pardoned at the last moment and deported to his own country. The funeral of the dead Irishman was attended by crowds of French as well as by all his compatriots in the neighbourhood. On their return from the cemetery, however, the French took control of the proceedings, demonstrated before the inn of *la belle Anglaise*, and broke into most of those frequented by English heretics—which, in view of the fact that the damaged taverns were all owned by Irish Catholics, doubtless led to sarcastic comments on Gallic impulsiveness. But we must look back from the date of this incident, 1716, to the year 1707, in order to re-establish contact between James Stuart—James III as he was styled in France—and the French privateers.

In January 1707, Pontchartrain, the Minister of Marine, received a memoir from the Jacobite Colonel Hook, laying down proposals for an invasion of Scotland. Hook himself was sent to prepare the ground ; by the end of the year the decision to invade had been definitely taken, and orders for the necessary preparations were issued. Command was given to the Chevalier de Forbin ; he collected at Dunkerque eleven King's ships, twenty privateer vessels, and twelve battalions of soldiers, some of them Irish and commanded by the Count de Gacé (afterwards Marshal de Matignon). On board de Forbin's flagship, the 'Mars,' was placed the camp equipment of the Old Pretender, transported from Saint-Germain in six large waggons—a bed with pillows of crimson damask and gold fringe ; a folding chair in black morocco ; six tables, of which four would join into one ; a marquee divisible into four rooms ; three smaller tents ; richly worked saddles with pistol-holsters ; saddle-cloths and bridles ; cases and chests ; cutlery and plate for eighteen diners ; provisions for fifteen days ; clothing and table linen ; and 300 lb. of candles. In addition Louis sent

900,000 livres, and Mary of Modena, the widow of James II and mother of the Pretender, gave a large sum of money and 280,000 livres in jewellery, her savings, it is said, out of the pension allowed her by the French king. On the eve of departure, Louis sent also a sword, begging James 'to wear it in a good cause, and to remember that it was a French sword.' In short, hopes of success seem to have run high in Versailles; and we can imagine the fond prayers with which Mary pictured her son's triumphant progress.

On the last day of February 1708, two confidential agents of the Pretender, Arnot and Fleming, arrived in Dunkerque, disguised and at nightfall, and immediately embarked on board separate privateer vessels for Scotland, where they were to supervise the final preparations for the rising already promised there. James let it be rumoured in Paris that he was about to attend a performance of the opera; instead, and with a suite of five, he rode as fast as horse could carry him to Dunkerque, cloaking his identity under the title of the Chevalier de Saint-Georges. Scarcely waiting to greet the notables who were assembled to salute him, he made for the harbour in order to raise anchor with the least possible delay; and almost at the same minute there appeared in the roadstead eighty English vessels of considerable size—the fleet of Admiral Byng, which had left Deal a day or two previously.* A council of the heads of the expedition was immediately called—a council which appears to have wrangled rather than to have faced the situation; at which, according to one member, 'the King [James] decides nothing, but repeatedly asks to be told what ought to be done'; of which the naval experts could not even name a harbour in the Firth of Forth that would shelter their fleet with any safety. And then, to crown all, on the following day James fell ill with measles.

From Paris orders were received to abandon the scheme; the Ministry of War and the Ministry of Marine, and their respective representatives at Dunkerque, were squabbling petulantly when, without warning or explanation, the English fleet vanished. Wasting no

* The spy who had conveyed news of the expedition to England, a man named Fonsacre, was arrested a year later. It is said that Anne had rewarded him with a comfortable pension.

further time, an ill and dispirited Pretender embarked on the 'Mars' and put out into a gale. Three or four vessels were so badly damaged in leaving port that they were compelled to return; the rest of the armada cast anchor off the Dutch coast until wind and sea should subside—a period of violent sea-sickness for James's suite. But James himself would not hear of putting back; the wind dropped to a breeze, and in a few days the Firth of Forth had been reached. Arrived opposite the Isle of May, the pre-arranged signals with Arnot and Fleming were given; but there was no response—the Dukes of Hamilton, Gordon, and Athol, the hopes of the Jacobite cause, had been already arrested in Edinburgh. And while the directing brains of the expedition were still impotently trying to decide their next move, decision was taken from them by the appearance of Byng's fleet in pursuit. Away ran the expeditionary force before it, agreeing to concentrate again at Cromarty or Inverness, and having to watch one of their finest ships fall into the clutches of the English vanguard.

James, thoroughly out of spirits, demanded to be put ashore with a servant and allowed to remain in Scotland at whatever cost, but de Forbin refused—was not the 'Mars' still chased by twenty Englishmen? By this time, however, Byng was beginning to fear for the seaworthiness of his own vessels; he called off the chase, therefore, and retired to watch and wait at Leith. Wherefore, de Forbin proposed a raid upon Inverness, to which James enthusiastically consented; but on reaching Buchan Ness, two privateer vessels sent for that purpose were unable to ship a pilot, and the 'Mars' found so high a sea raging that it was considered impossible to round the headland. Moreover, provisions were running short. Reluctantly, the remains of the fleet turned homewards, reaching Dunkerque at the end of March. While this sorry, bedraggled attempt was hailed in certain quarters as a moral victory, on account of the disorganisation it occasioned in England, the privateers knew it for what it was. They had interrupted their own cruises to take part in it, furnished their own vessels, crews, and provisions. Some of them, undeterred by high seas, had reached Cromarty and waited there in imminent danger of capture; others had rounded Scotland and made

their way, by the west of Ireland, to Brest. In their hands alone, the result might have been different; but they had been placed under the orders of dilatory naval officers, and revenged themselves by clamouring during several years for compensation. The years were necessary to enable the Treasury to raise the requisite funds—and even then most of the privateers were out of pocket.

While the corsairs had no part in the events of 1715, they had ample opportunity of becoming familiar with the Bonnie Prince Charlie thirty years later.

The Forty-Five, however, was preceded, a year earlier, by another attempt to invade England in the Jacobite interest, with 15,000 men under Marshal Saxe, and thirty-seven privateer vessels from Dunkerque, le Havre, Saint-Malo, Nantes, and Rochefort, commanded by the aged Count de Roquefeuil. Under an incognito which signally failed to disguise either him or the significance of the preparations then going rapidly forward, the Young Pretender watched the course of events from Gravelines. But bad weather delayed the embarkation of the troops, and before a powerful British fleet, encountered off Dungeness, de Roquefeuil hesitated and was nearly lost. Two privateers from Dunkerque, Nicolas Looten and Jean Rombout, were captured while carrying despatches of great importance; and a few days later, the fleet returned to port with the news that the Admiral had died at sea. With the English in command of the Channel, it seemed useless to pursue the enterprise. Prince Charles, bitter at what he considered a craven dereliction, refused to leave Gravelines, and had to be brought back almost by force; and for the next year was busy in preparing an invasion on his own account.

In this endeavour, invaluable assistance was forthcoming from three Irish shipowners—O'Heguerty, who spent much of his time in Court circles at Versailles; Rutledge of Dunkerque; and Anthony Walsh of Nantes. Enthusiastic Jacobites, and fallen under the spell of the Pretender's winning personality, they advanced him money and gave him an interest in their privateering and trading ventures; but all the time they were hatching a plot with him, hints of which creep occasionally into the correspondence between them. At last, O'Heguerty was

able to lay a completed plan before the Count de Maurepas, the Minister of Marine, involving the use of Royal ships on the understanding that they were commanded, not by naval officers of whose ineptitude the Stuart cause had good reason to be aware, but by bold and hardy corsair captains who would stick at nothing to reach their goal. The Minister, his pride a little piqued, vacillated ; Charles Edward grew impatient ; three months passed in whisperings behind closed doors. During the first days of July 1745, however, Walsh, Sheridan, equerry to Charles Edward, and the Prince himself, stepped on board the ' Du Teillay ' at the mouth of the Loire. The ' Du Teillay ' was a small frigate carrying a crew of sixty-seven men, owned by Walsh and commanded by Charles Durbé, one of the best-known privateers of Nantes ; at Belle-Ile, on the south coast of Brittany, she was joined by the ' Elisabeth,' a 500-ton vessel mounting sixty-four guns, lent by Louis XV, fitted out by Rutledge, and commanded by Pierre Dehau with Pierre Bart, cousin of the famous Jean, as second-in-command.

Five days out, off Brest, they ran into the ' Lion,' a British two-decker of sixty guns. For several hours she and the ' Elisabeth ' pounded each other without a chance presenting itself to board, while the ' Du Teillay,' less heavily armed, could do nothing but keep out of range. By evening the fight seems to have worn itself out. According to French accounts, the British vessel, with her skipper severely wounded, hauled down her flag, but, seeing the ' Elisabeth ' in no state to take possession, made off into the darkness. Her commander, Captain (afterwards Sir Peircy) Brett, in regretting that he had not been able to effect the capture of the Young Pretender, wrote that ' I have only the satisfaction left that I spoiled his voyage.' He spoiled it, perhaps, better than he knew ; the ' Elisabeth,' with a casualty roll in killed and wounded of 185, including her captain, had been so badly damaged by gunfire that she was obliged to abandon the ' Du Teillay ' and limp into Brest, carrying with her a large part of the stores and munitions intended for the invasion. On went the smaller vessel alone, touching at several of the Hebrides, but unable to make a landing. At last, at the beginning of August, she put the Prince and a handful of faithful followers ashore on Eriskay ;

Walsh and Durbé bade him God-speed, and returned to France. The Jacobite adventure had begun.

A few weeks later, Dunkerque, always a hive of activity, was startled into feverishness by urgent messages from de Maurepas, ordering arms, munitions, money, and men to be sent at once to Scotland. The port became filled with Jacobite officers clamouring to be embarked. Four corsair vessels—the ‘*Espérance*’ (Captain Norbert Kempinck) with several highly-placed officers, the ‘*Hareng-Couronnée*’ (Pierre Berlament) with two thousand six hundred muskets and other arms for twelve hundred men, the ‘*Neptune*’ (Valéry Jolly) and the ‘*Saint Geneviève*’ (François Loiseau), both laden with money and miscellaneous stores—set out in quick succession, landed their various cargoes at Montrose or Stonehaven in the face of Byng’s squadron, and returned with letters and news of the amazing successes won by the Pretender. A steady stream of corsair craft, transporting now five hundred men of the Royal Scots Regiment, now four hundred Irish troops in the French service under Lord Drummond, now arms, now munitions, and increasingly expert in evading the English fleet, acted not only as the carriers, but also to a large extent as the international spies of the insurgent Jacobites.

These voyages did not always, of course, end without incident. In November, the ‘*Fine*,’ commanded by a young naval officer, de Rosmadec, and in company with two privateer ships, ‘*Espérance*’ and ‘*Renommée*,’ set out from Dunkerque. Off the Dutch coast the ‘*Espérance*’ was captured; the remaining two continued their voyage to Montrose, where Lord Drummond, who was a passenger on board the ‘*Fine*,’ wished to land. There de Rosmadec seized an English cutter which had attempted to prevent them from approaching the shore; but scarcely was the landing completed when Byng himself, in the ‘*Newcastle*,’ appeared on the scene. The ‘*Renommée*’ made her escape; the ‘*Fine*’ was trapped in a narrow channel and could only run aground to avoid being taken. For the next few days, Byng patrolled the waters about Montrose; meanwhile, a small corsair squadron had landed reinforcements higher up the coast, at Peterhead.

With matters progressing so favourably in Scotland,
Vol. 256.—No. 508. Y

Louis XV again set his mind upon invading England. At the end of 1745, thirty thousand men under the Duke de Richelieu and the Count de Lowendal were concentrated between Dunkerque and Boulogne; nearly two hundred vessels of all kinds, though most of them small, were fitted out under the direction of Walsh in ports along the Channel seaboard. But once more divided counsels and an atmosphere of amateurishness, both among the leaders in the field and the politicians at Versailles, were to wreck the purposeful industry of men such as Walsh, who knew what was required and were willing to labour in providing it. With the relinquishing of this huge expedition, France was to miss the most favourable opportunity offered throughout the eighteenth century of dealing a mortal blow at her long-standing enemy. At the end of January 1746, it had not been decided whether the landing should be made in Cornwall or Essex. De Richelieu was frankly opposed to the entire plan, and asked for nothing better than to be relieved of his post; meanwhile, no step was taken to secure the command of the Channel, with the result that French ships were captured or sunk almost as soon as they left port. Costs were soaring and precious time was slipping by; but nothing was done. In February orders were received to 'reduce expenses without undue noise,' and to embark detachments of troops for Scotland as circumstances might warrant. The fleet was released, many of the troops dispersed, and the wish of de Richelieu granted.

Nevertheless, the corsairs were active enough throughout in carrying troops, though constant gales delayed them. During February several dozen left port, with varying luck; in addition to bad weather, they had now to face an opposition of great determination. A British squadron constantly patrolled the Channel; forty ships of the line, reinforced by smaller vessels, formed a chain from the mouth of the Thames to the Dutch coast; Byng guarded the east of Scotland and detached frigates at frequent intervals to cruise about the north and west. But it was not only at sea that events moved in favour of the British; on land, the Young Pretender was in retreat, his adherents falling away from his standard or being wasted in following it. Corsair after corsair found

herself chased and forced either to yield, to blow up, or to run aground; several captains, as a last extremity, disembarked their men, marched them across the Highlands, and joined the Jacobite forces as undisciplined recruits. At last the 'Émeraude,' commanded by a young naval lieutenant, the Chevalier de Saint Allouarn, arrived off Aberdeen, and sent two of his officers in a boat to speak with the shore. As they drew near, they saw a man carrying a gun, and with a dog at his side, signalling them with his hat to sheer off; but since they continued to approach, he shouted to them that all was lost. A crowd of peasants, which soon collected about them, confirmed the news. The 'Émeraude' hurried back to France; within a few days de Maurepas had broadcast orders that no further troops were to be sent, and that only money, smuggled into Scotland by any means whatever, would now be of use.

Then followed Prince Charlie's five months of wandering and hiding throughout the length and breadth of the Western Isles. With a price of 30,000*l.* on his head, no refuge was safe from spies and informants. De Maurepas became frantic in his demands that at all costs Charles Edward must be saved. From Dunkerque he ordered the 'Bourbon' and the 'Charité,' with two well-known privateer captains, Charles Lemoine and Godefroi Bachelier, in command, to effect the Pretender's rescue; both were captured by the English. He applied to Walsh, who fitted out the 'Mars' and the 'Bellone.' On their way to Scotland they were attacked and, though they managed to drive off their assailants, arrived at Kilmore in a pitiable condition. It was at Kilmore that they had reckoned upon picking up the fugitive; but he had fled three days previously, whither they could not ascertain. One after another, small and rapid corsairs took up the quest. The 'Lévrier-Volant,' with Dumay of Boulogne in command, reached the Hebrides in safety and put ashore a Jacobite officer disguised as a sailor; he returned with tidings that the district was covered with English troops and that no one could give him information as to the Pretender's whereabouts. In continuing her search, the 'Lévrier-Volant' was chased and attacked, but succeeded in dodging her pursuers among the islands; after many adventures she was compelled

to abandon her mission and return to Morlaix. Next, Pierre Anguier set sail from Dunkerque in the 'Bien-Trouvé,' carrying a party of naval cadets, and with orders not to come back without the Prince, or at least without an order from him in his own handwriting. He landed his little company in the northern extremity of the mainland, after having fixed a rendezvous; while they hunted the country-side for the missing Prince, Anguier searched the isles, found nothing but a British frigate, the 'Glasgow,' and was captured by her.

Jean-François Cheyné, though he managed to return to France in the 'Comte-de-Maurepas,' spent a fruitless month among the sounds and the lochs of the Hebrides; never once did he come near finding the man he sought. Similarly, Mathieu Dumont was compelled to bring back a thousand guineas with which Rutledge had entrusted him for the Pretender's welfare; on a second voyage he escaped capture only by a ruse, rescued two Jacobite leaders, and would have extricated the Pretender himself had not twelve hundred soldiers appeared in the neighbourhood and forced the unhappy Prince to fly from his deliverers. Then a gale drove Dumont to the coasts of Norway, where he learned of thirteen Jacobite officers who had escaped from Bergen to Göttenborg and were stranded penniless, without even the means of changing their disguise.

There had escaped to France, however, four officers who were in the inner counsels of the Jacobites—the Pretender's equerry Sheridan, his aide-de-camp Colonel Warren, Captain Lynch, and Captain O'Brien. An Irish shipowner of Saint-Malo, Butler by name, fitted out two corsair vessels, the 'Heureux' and the 'Prince-de-Conti,' giving them to two of his captains, Beaulieu-Tréhouard and Dufresne-Marion; Dumay, an interpreter, and a Scottish pilot were added to the staff, and, with the four Jacobites on board, set sail from a lonely cove near Cap Fréhel—a point of departure which enabled them to avoid Saint-Malo, its gossip, and its spies. A fortnight later their anxieties were relieved. At the end of his resources and almost of his strength, Charles Edward embarked at Moidart upon the 'Prince-de-Conti'—whose name may well have awakened in his breast an echo of his grandfather's flight nearly sixty years

previously—and, after three weeks' buffeting, arrived safely at Roscoff. His adventure, begun with such romantic hope, had drawn to a pitiable close—and it was to the French privateers, no less than to Flora Macdonald, that he owed his life.

To each corsair vessel he gave a hundred louis, fifty for the captain and fifty to be divided among the crews. The captains, who belonged to some of the best families in Saint-Malo, excused themselves from receiving a gratification in cash; the crews took both shares readily enough and considered them none too generous. But compared with the Prince the crews were, after all, not entirely out of luck; at least they had a tangible reward for their trouble, whereas he had nothing but defeat and suffering to look back upon—though, indeed, the 'splendid suppers' with which he was regaled at Versailles may possibly have ensured him a consolation at least temporary.

W. BRANCH JOHNSON.

Art. 9.—THE INTERNATIONAL FISHERY INVESTIGATIONS.

Conseil permanent International pour l'Exploration de la Mer.

1. *Rapports et Procès-Verbaux des Réunions*, Vols. I-LXV. Copenhagen, 1903-30.
2. *Bulletin Statistique des Pêches Maritimes des Pays du Nord de l'Europe*, Vols. I-XVII. Copenhagen, 1906-29.
3. *Publications de Circonstance*. Copenhagen, Nos. 1-91, 1903-25.
4. *Bulletin (Trimestriel) des Résultats acquis pendant les croisières périodiques*. 1903-29.
5. *Journal de Conseil*, Vols. I-IV. 1926-29.

ON the initiative of the late King Oscar II of Sweden a Conference was held at Stockholm in 1899 to which the Governments of Germany, Denmark, Great Britain, Holland, Norway, and Russia were invited to send delegates. The object of the Conference was 'to elaborate a plan for the joint exploration, in the interest of the sea fisheries, of the hydrographical and biological conditions of the Arctic and the North and Baltic Seas.' As a result of this and a subsequent Conference the British Government consented to participate, with the other nations concerned, in a scheme for the exploration of the seas off North-Western Europe in the interests of the fisheries. A permanent International Council was established, consisting of two representatives of each participating nation, with a Central Office at Copenhagen and a Central Laboratory at Oslo. Each country agreed, in addition to subsidising its own portion of the research scheme, to make an annual grant to the Central Council for administrative and incidental expenses. When the Council was thus established with an annual subsidy it set to work on three main lines of research :

1. The study of hydrographical conditions.
2. The investigation of the biological conditions of the seas.
3. The solution of the problem of how far the deep-sea fishery as a commercial industry stands in general on a rational basis ; whether the quantities and consumption

of fish taken from the North and neighbouring seas are in a proper proportion to the production occurring under the prevailing natural conditions, and whether any disproportion arises from a general or local over-fishing, or from an injudicious employment of the fishing apparatus at present in use.

It is now nearly thirty years since the international investigations were inaugurated, and therefore the time seems opportune for a *résumé* of the results obtained. Short summaries have appeared from time to time dealing with the efforts of individual nations, notably in the Swedish, German, and English languages; and in 1928 a special volume was published by the Council giving an account of the work of the participating countries since the foundation of the Council.

Great Britain's undertaking for these international researches was in the first place for a period of three years only; a sum of 42,000*l.* being voted by the Government for this purpose. At the termination of that three-year period, Great Britain consented to participate for another two years, and since the investigations have continued to the present day (apart from an interruption caused by the War) they may now reasonably be regarded as permanent. The total expenditure incurred by Great Britain to Dec. 31, 1913, on the international fishery investigations was 154,919*l.*, exclusive of the cost of publications. At the present time, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, to whom the English share of the investigations is allotted, expend about 23,000*l.* a year on scientific work, the bulk of which is devoted to the international explorations. There is a separate account for Scotland, which conducts similar investigations in Scottish waters.

At the outset each participating country was allotted a certain area of the sea for special investigation, co-ordination in making the records being particularly required in hydrographical work, and, in addition to a general support of the Central Council and its adjuncts, each country undertook to provide a specially equipped steamer for the observations and collections at sea in addition to one or more marine laboratories ashore. Not only so, but the Central Council, at an early stage of the work, set up Committees of Experts for the investiga-

tion of special problems; these various Committees compiled and prepared reports and conclusions for submission to the Central Council. Thus, almost from the beginning, we find a special Committee concerned with the hydrographical observations; another dealing with the migrations of the most important fishes of the North Sea, especially the herring and cod; another Committee dealing with over-fishing; and still another dealing with the Fisheries of the Baltic. An important Committee was appointed to investigate the Plaice fisheries, since it was thought that the plaice was a fish particularly susceptible to the influence of over-fishing. In 1926 a Whaling Committee was appointed and a special Committee set up to consider the question of a general bibliography of oceanography in concert with the Oceanographical Section of the Geodesic and Geophysical Union. At present there are eighteen separate Committees, in addition to the Consultative Committee, to which the reports and conclusions of the various Committees are submitted before being passed on to the Council. All Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Scientific Committees are ordinary members of the Consultative Committee.

The number of participating countries has greatly increased since the first establishment of the Council in 1902, when Germany, Great Britain, Russia (with Finland), Denmark, Holland, Sweden, and Norway were members. Since then the following countries have joined the Council: Belgium, Spain, France, Italy, Latvia, the Irish Free State, Poland, and Portugal; with the result that the field of operations has considerably extended and the Council shows signs of suffering from defects which are inseparable from an organisation which has grown unwieldy. The United States of America joined the Council in 1912, but the War terminated their adherence, and apparently it has not been resumed. The income of the Council is derived from grants made by the participating nations. Recent estimates show that the income approximates from 157,000 to 177,000 Danish kroner (8,600*l.* to 9,780*l.*); the annual contributions of the Governments varying from 2,000 kroner (Latvia) to 20,000 kroner (Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain). Incidentally we read in the report for 1926-27 that Russia's contribution for 1914-15, amounting to

14,430 roubles, deposited in a Leningrad Bank, has not yet been recovered.

This, we think, gives a fair idea of the working methods of the investigations. The Council meets usually once a year, at which the reports of the experts are considered and the necessary action on them taken. Now as regards the publications. These fall into two main divisions: firstly, the reports and publications of the Council, which come into five main groups as enumerated above. But in addition to the official publications of the Council there is a host of volumes dealing with the investigations undertaken and the results arrived at by each of the participating nations. Generally speaking, the papers are published in each country in a scientific journal. In Great Britain the reports of the individual research scientists are issued as Government Blue-Books.

When Great Britain first agreed to take part in the scheme there was no staff at the Central Fisheries Department, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, capable of performing the required duties, so that the English portion of the research work was allotted to the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom with headquarters at Plymouth. In Scotland, where a strong and resourceful Central Department, the Scottish Fishery Board, was in existence, the investigations were from the first carried on by the staff. This work consisted of the northern half of the British share of the international scheme of work, and may roughly be divided into biological observations and experiments, hydrographical researches, and statistical inquiries. It will not, perhaps, be unfair to say that the relations between the Marine Biological Association and the staff at the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries were never very harmonious; but no useful purpose would now be served by dwelling on the friction which ensued; it is sufficient to say that in 1910 the Ministry took over the southern portion of the British sphere of investigation from the Marine Biological Association. A special staff was engaged by the Ministry, and this staff was and still is carrying on the investigations; first at London, but later in a specially equipped marine laboratory at Lowestoft.

There are unquestionable advantages in the concentration of the work in one Central Department, where the

statistical records are accumulated for analysis and where also the Department is in close touch with the various sections of the Fish Trade, for the benefit of which the scheme was originally inaugurated. The Department is responsible for the issue of monographs written by the research workers, though presumably it does not accept responsibility for the opinions expressed by individual scientists, but probably these are never of a revolutionary nature, since there is internal evidence, in some cases, of a drastic editorship of the reports. In addition, the Assistant Secretary for Fisheries, Mr H. G. Maurice, gives a summary of the year's work of the international investigations in the Annual Report on the Sea Fisheries, which is presented to Parliament. The number and bulk of the volumes already published, either by the Council direct or by the participating countries, is colossal and forms a library of general marine research in all its branches. No one man could attempt to review critically this vast accumulation of scientific literature; but it is, we hope, possible to assess, if only approximately, its value to the fisheries. An assessment of this kind must necessarily omit much that would be considered of primary importance by the pure scientist, and the omission of any reference here to a section of the investigations does not imply that it is not of the highest scientific interest.

Reference must first be made to the Hydrographical investigations, even though they are of a severely technical nature. It has long been known that sea fish are sensitive to changes in their environment, and in particular to changes in the temperature, salinity, and gaseous contents of the water in which they live. Consequently any attempt to build up the life-histories of our valuable marine fish must be preceded by a study of the hydrographical conditions of their environments. The influence of the tides and currents must not be omitted from consideration. Put briefly, the international investigations have been designed to analyse the above features, particularly as they affect the sea fisheries. The layman who is appalled by the size and technicality of the hydrographical reports must not hastily condemn them because they are not easily understandable.

Recently a Committee of the Economic Advisory

Council has been inquiring into fishery problems under the chairmanship of Dr Addison. As a result of this inquiry the Government has decided to build and equip a vessel of the modern steam-trawler type for the exploration of new and more distant fishing-grounds. To omit from consideration the hydrographical knowledge accumulated would nullify the usefulness of the new vessel. One thing strikes the reader of the reports, and that is the stimulus given by the international investigations to the invention and perfection of hydrographical apparatus. For the collection of water samples at all depths we have improved bottles, notably the Petterson-Nansen and the Ekman; for the investigation of bottom-currents the improved current meters of which that of Ekman may be mentioned. The employment of suitable drift bottles and bottom-trailers, the perfection of deep-sea thermometers and the improvement of the analytical apparatus in the shore laboratories, are all rightly attributable to the skill and resource of the international workers in this field. Attempts have been made to prove the connection between certain hydrographical conditions, such as optimum temperature and salinity with the appearance of shoals of valuable fish such as the herring; and conversely the disappearance of shoals under unfavourable hydrographical conditions; and there can be little or no doubt that this line of inquiry opens up fields of speculation, even though we are not yet in a position to prophesy the future harvests of the sea, as some of the more sanguine investigators seem to think is the case.

The Biological problems are equally formidable and perhaps even more interesting to the layman, since they are more directly concerned with the habits and life-histories of our commercially valuable fish; and bound up closely with them is the question of the use to be made of and the practical deductions to be derived from the collection of the trade fishery statistics. The weight and value of each species of fish landed in each country and the quantity yielded by each separate fishing-ground have to be studied from year to year. Returns are now available, not only from each fishing port, but in the case of the larger vessels such as the steam trawlers, of each individual voyage, showing the number of days' absence

from port, the number of days' fishing, the weight of the fish caught, and in many species the classification into trade sizes and the particular area in which the fishing was carried on. For statistical purposes the fishing-grounds are considered separately, and in the case of some of the more important areas, such as the North Sea, there is a further division into sub-areas. By means of the exploratory voyages made by the various scientific vessels a picture of the fauna of the fishing-grounds is obtained and this, supplemented by the trade returns, when collected long enough and carefully enough, should give an accurate idea of the productivity of any given area. Measurements of the sizes of certain fish are made when opportunity occurs, not only on the trawlers but at the port of landing. In this way very large samples, e.g. of the plaice, have been analysed. And, in fact, the investigations show that, as a result of this accumulation of data, we are within reasonable distance of determining the productivity of each of our important fishing areas. Each fish must be considered separately. Once a definite value is placed on a given area it behoves the International Council to offer such advice to the various Governments as shall secure the perpetuation of the maximum productivity or, at least, to ensure against over-fishing.

Merely to enumerate the problems investigated would exhaust our space, nevertheless, a few selected questions must be dealt with. The investigation of the life-history of each species of fish involves researches into its food, spawning habits, rate of growth, age at first maturity, and migrations. The study of the distribution of the food of the fish, the plant and invertebrate animal life, necessitated the services of another group of specialists. Some of these problems are investigated by marking fish with numbered labels and their subsequent liberation at selected spots. This has been particularly successful in the case of the plaice, cod, and salmon. The migrations of these fish are now established, and since they are measured before liberation and after the recapture their rate of growth is known. Unfortunately, some species are not susceptible of marking. The herring, for instance, does not survive the handling necessary to the experiment.

In the case of the herring much information has been obtained by a study of the scales. If the scale of a herring

be examined under the microscope it will be found to consist of two distinct portions, one of which presents no marked characteristics. The other consists of a number of pale zones, each surrounded by a dark ring. The pale zone is formed in the summer, when the growth of the fish takes place; the dark ring in winter, when growth to all intents and purposes ceases. Consequently a zone and ring indicate a year's life of the fish, and if the rings be counted we can form an indication of the age of the fish. In practice the work is not quite so simple as would appear from this description, but it can safely be assumed that in many species a study of the scales affords valuable information, not only of the age, but of the habits of the fish, more particularly its rate of growth from year to year. Interesting results have also been obtained from a study of the scales of the salmon. Now, since all herring shoals do not live under uniform conditions, it follows that the scales of different shoals vary, in some cases to an extreme degree. The Norwegian investigations, in particular, claim to trace the migrations of herring from year to year and from place to place solely on scale-reading observations. Corroborative evidence as to age may be obtained by observations on the annual growth-rings in the otoliths (ear-stones). This method has been found especially valuable in the case of the plaice.

Another point of practical interest which has been largely elucidated by the international investigations is that concerned with the spawning of fish, the egg production, distribution of the eggs and larvæ and the conditions influencing larval and post-larval life. It is no exaggeration to say that our knowledge of the structure, development, and distribution of the pelagic eggs of our valuable marine fish has been enormously increased as a result of the international work. Attempts have been made to determine, from the number of floating eggs in a given area, the number of spawners and in this way to take stock of the adult fish of a given species on certain fishing-grounds. Still another branch of marine biology which has received a remarkable stimulus is the study of the Plankton, the name given to the microscopic organisms which float in the surface layers of the sea and to which the term 'pastures of the sea' has been given, since they form, directly or indirectly, the basis of the food supply of many

of our most important sea fish. It is not too much to say that all fish-life depends on the plankton, or, at least, on its vegetable or plant constituents. Plants are able to manufacture organic from inorganic substances under the influences of sunlight, the other essential factor being the presence of inorganic substances or salts in the sea-water. If these inorganic substances fall below a certain minimum the production of plankton ceases. This question, which has been especially developed by German investigators, affords a basis for philosophical speculations of a wide nature involving the cycle of life in the Sea. Not only has the distribution of the plankton in the sea been studied, but estimates have been made by means of special nets to determine the quantity of plankton in a given area, and so to compare the productivity of the sea with an equal area of cultivated land.

The most spectacular event in the history of the international investigations is the solution of the mystery of the spawning of the eel. It has been known for centuries that young eels in the form of elvers move up the rivers of the British Isles and Western Europe in the spring, and that large eels—the silver eels—move down in the autumn to the sea. Once these silver eels get to the sea they disappear, at any rate off the British coast. But in the Baltic there is a regular fishery for these eels, which are caught in basket-like traps, the openings of which are set in the direction of the migration paths of the eel. The Danish investigators working under the auspices of the International Council marked a number of these eels with labels. The results of the experiment proved that the migration of the eel is always in a seaward direction and proceeds with rapidity, since an eel marked at Tvarminne in Finland on Aug. 15 was recaptured on the east coast of Jutland near Helgø near Nov. 16 following, having travelled 745 miles in three months. It has also been known for some time that young eels develop from a totally different form, the *Leptocephalus*, a name given to the larval eel because, when first discovered, it was thought to be a distinct species. A French zoologist, Delage, succeeded in keeping a *Leptocephalus* for seven months in an aquarium at Roscoff, and observed its transformation into a young conger. A form of *Leptocephalus* known as *brevirostris* is the larval stage of the

common fresh-water eel. Now, until recently these *Leptocephali* were rarely met with at sea. Dr Schmidt organised a systematic search for them with the Danish investigating steamer 'Thor.' This search was facilitated by the accidental discovery of a solitary *Leptocephalus brevirostris* off the Faroe Islands, where the water was over 500 metres deep. Following up this clue, Schmidt used a fine-meshed midwater net—the Scheer net—and soon made good catches, the best being off the South-West of Ireland. These eel larvæ are true pelagic forms, living in the upper layers of water.

Eventually the spawning places of the European fresh-water eel were located in a restricted area in the West Atlantic, not far from the West Indies (between 22° and 30° N. and 65° and 48° W.). Spawning begins in late winter and is continued to the beginning of summer. In June larvæ of 25 millimetres in length were found on the spawning-ground, while at the same time larvæ of 75 millimetres were found off the coastal banks west of Europe. These were over two years old. An intermediate group, above one year old and from 50 to 60 millimetres in length, is found in early summer in the Central Atlantic. The eel is unique among fish on account of the enormous migration it makes in its larval stage, from the West Atlantic to Europe, a journey which takes over two years although it is assisted by the general eastward drift of the Gulf Stream. The spawning places of the American eel were also located by the Danish investigators. They are in the ocean to the north of the West Indies, somewhat farther west and south than those of the common European eel, though the spawning-grounds possibly overlap to some extent. But the American eel reaches its full development from the egg to glass-eel in about one year, while the European eel takes nearly three years. In the American eel the pelagic life is too short for it to reach Europe; while the larvæ of the European eel, so long as they remain in the Western Atlantic, are too far away in development from the stage at which they seek the rivers. A striking solution of an ages-old problem.

When we consider the relationship between the International Council and the practical side of the sea fisheries, a sense of disappointment is felt. This, perhaps,

may be best expressed by dealing with certain specific instances and those by no means of a minor or insignificant nature. The first and most important is the Plaice question. From what has already been said it will be gathered that, prior to the establishment of the International Council, anxiety had been felt, among those best qualified to judge, as to the future of the plaice and the plaice fisheries. Indeed, Bills had been introduced into the British Parliament in 1900 and 1904 having for their object the prevention of the landing, sale, or exposure for sale of species of flat fish below a certain minimum expressed in the Bill; the object, of course, being to protect the undersized flatfish so that a sufficient number should attain maturity to ensure the perpetuation of the species in numbers adequate to maintain a commercial fishery. None of these Bills was successful, so that when the international researches were commenced, particular attention was devoted to the plaice question. As stated above, a special Committee was appointed to deal with this question, and after much deliberation it reported to the Council in 1913. It must be admitted that the recommendations of the Committee were of a disappointing nature. The Plaice Committee recommended, and the Council adopted, a proposal for prohibiting, in the various countries concerned, the landing of plaice from the North Sea under twenty centimetres (eight inches) in length, with a proviso that from April 1 to Sept. 30 the minimum length should be twenty-two centimetres. Now, although the size limit question sounds easy and attractive, there are certain practical difficulties in enforcing it which make it in all probability futile for the protection of sea fish. Be that as it may, the outbreak of war put an end to the deliberations of the Council, and the undersized plaice proposals were shelved, permanently as it now appears. The War effected a very practical closure of the North Sea fishing-grounds, so that plaice and other fish were given an opportunity of recuperating unhindered by the attentions of the British and other trawlers. Nevertheless, the plaice question was reopened by the Council after the close of the War; but this time the undersized fish proposals were abandoned and suggestions were made for the closure of certain areas in the North Sea, outside the territorial limits, known to be frequented by small plaice.

The closure was to be effective as regards steam trawlers and the larger motor vessels. The area, in the eastern part of the North Sea off the coast of the Low Countries, was to be limited by the depth of the water, since on the regularly sloping continental coasts these depths are easily ascertained by the fishermen, who in fact work by the lead. The areas of delimitation did not vary much from those which had already been suggested in 1890 by the English trawling industry. After a thorough discussion, seasons of closure were adopted by the Committee, and these were calculated so as to procure the desired results with as little interference as possible to other fisheries, especially to that for haddock. There can be no doubt that these recommendations represent the conclusions of the workers who have devoted the greatest amount of attention to the problems involved. By 1925, the position in regard to the suggestions for closed areas was clarified, and arrangements were being made to prosecute the matter when the British Trawlers' Federation expressed their unwillingness to co-operate further and, since the official British opinion was that such co-operation was essential to the success of the scheme, no further steps have been taken; and this in spite of the fact that by the measures proposed, foreign trawling operations would be far more restricted than those of Great Britain, and that the protected plaice would spread over all the North Sea grounds, while the number protected in the first instance was 26 millions, not enough materially to crowd the North Sea. According to the international marking experiments and statistics, the gain effected would rise in five years to over half a million pounds (585,000*l.*) per annum and thereafter remain at least at this level, if it did not exceed it. Here then we have an example of a trade organisation successfully blocking a scheme for the protection and development of a great natural asset, after such scheme had been adopted by practically all the experts who had been engaged in examining it over a long period of years. As an alternative the principle of transplantation of plaice was approved!

It is claimed that plaice transplanted from the Eastern grounds to the Dogger Bank show an extraordinary increase in growth. Plaice put on the Bank grew thirteen

centimetres in length in a year, compared with six centimetres for those left on the coastal grounds from which the transplanted fish were taken. The increase in weight was well over three times their liberation weight; while the fish on the coastal area only doubled their weight. It has been proposed, seriously, to transplant fish on a commercial scale from the Eastern grounds to the Dogger. The International Council will gain no kudos from the adoption of such a plan, since the practical difficulties are obvious and insurmountable. The loss in the operations of catching, transporting, and liberating the fish; the division of the expense between the participating nationalities, the impossibility of preventing the capture of the fish within a few days or weeks of liberation, since they are on the high seas, are obstacles too difficult to overcome.

The collection and analysis of the commercial fisheries statistics, though improved enormously of recent years, is still open to criticism. Mr Archer, the chief British delegate, in 1907 said :

' that he could not promise at the present time that the place of fishing would be indicated in the English returns, even if the samples were grouped according to the international scheme of areas. His Department were under certain obligations to the fishing trade with regard to the publication of the material, which prevented their supplying copies of the original returns and necessitated a careful scrutiny of any tabulation according to areas. Moreover, the English material so greatly exceeded that of any other country, that it did not appear reasonable to expect the Bureau to deal with it in its crude state.'

This is largely true to-day, and would indicate that there is room for improvement in the handling of the official returns. Of the other Committees of the International Council a brief reference must be made to two, which are grouped under the heading 'Special Committees.'

The first deals with the Moray Firth. The Firth was closed by the Scottish Fishery Board in 1892, in accordance with powers given by a special Act of the British Parliament. Since a considerable portion of the Firth was outside the 'three-mile limit,' the question of enforcing the closure against foreign trawlers has always been a delicate one. There is no doubt that the policy

of the Scottish Fishery Board was influenced by representations made by our Foreign Office, and that the closure of the Moray Firth has only been effectual in the case of British trawlers. This was one of the first practical and scientific difficulties in Scotland to take a definitely international aspect. When the Firth was first closed special scientific investigations were designed with a view of ascertaining the effect of the measure on the fisheries; and on account of its great value and importance as a fishing area the Moray Firth received special attention in the subsequent investigations. These, however, were vitiated by the operations of foreign trawlers, against whom the closure was not enforced. The question was raised at the International Conference at Oslo as long ago as 1901, when the following resolution was passed:

'In distinct areas of the sea—as for example the Moray Firth—in which any Government has undertaken experiments in the interests of the fisheries and in which the success of the experiments is being hindered by the operations of trawlers, it is to be desired that measures be adopted for the removal of such hindrances.'

Truly a pious resolution! The unsatisfactory position of the Moray Firth continued, and in 1925 the matter was referred to the International Council, which, at the request of the British delegates, set up a special Committee to inquire into the whole question. In the interval—between 1892 and 1925—the fisheries of the Moray Firth show important changes in the distribution of the fishing population, the composition of the fishing fleet and the methods of fishing employed. The whole economic conditions of the industry have been transformed by the advent of the steam and large motor drifter and by the introduction of the cod-net and the Danish seine. The report of the Moray Firth Committee was finally printed in 1927, to be treated as a confidential paper until the British Government, which was most interested in the problems and on whose initiative the study of the question had been undertaken, had fixed a date for publication. It appeared in December 1928, but there were no epoch-making recommendations. Meanwhile the position in the Moray Firth is unaltered.

Another special Committee of immediate importance

is the Whaling Committee. At a meeting of this Committee, held in Paris in 1927, suggestions were adopted for a detailed investigation into the habits of whales. Not only so, but a draft convention for the regulation of the catch of whales outside territorial waters, which had been prepared by the French Inter-ministerial Committee, was considered. It was decided that the terms of reference of the Committee would only permit the study and examination of this document, and consequently no resolution was passed thereon. It would be unfair to cavil at this; nevertheless, we hope that the Whaling Committee may shortly put forward concrete proposals for a limitation of the slaughter of whales now taking place, and that such limitation may become effective before it is too late.

In conclusion, there is one further criticism. A close study of the publications issued by two of the leading nations shows signs of a desire in some cases to interpret the facts in favour of the official view of the national fishery interests. The publications referred to are not those of the International Bureau, but of individual scientists issued nationally. Whether the opinions expressed in these papers are attributable to the authors alone or whether they have been officially edited does not appear. It is, however, much to be regretted that the interpretation of facts dealing with a great natural asset common to all the maritime nations of Northern and Western Europe should be biased by supposed national interests. The power of the Fish Trade has been seen in the case of the plaice fishery recommendations and in the statistical returns. In spite of these criticisms there can be no doubt of the enormous improvement in our knowledge of marine problems resulting from the international investigations. The task of reconciling national interests with an international outlook on the whole has been fairly and adequately accomplished, and not a little credit is due on this and other accounts to Mr Maurice, the Fisheries Secretary at the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries and since 1920 the President of the International Council, who by his tact and ability has helped to promote the harmonious feeling necessary to the deliberations of any international body.

J. TRAVIS JENKINS.

Art. 10.—SOLDIERS' SLANG.

1. *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English.* By Ernest Weekley. Murray, 1921.
2. *Songs and Slang of the British Soldier, 1914-1918.* Edited by John Brophy. The Scholartis Press, 1930.
And other works.

THIS article concerns only such Army slang words, and far from all such words, as have a history and an origin at least as far back as 1830. It is instructive, at the beginning of this year 1931, to turn to Professor Weekley's 'Etymological Dictionary.' In the Preface, which bears the date of September 1920, we learn that there has been an influx of foreign words and that

'among such foreign words are many neologisms due to the Great War, a certain number of which may successfully resist that demobilisation of the war-words which is now actively proceeding. The more recondite foreign technicalities of war have been avoided, but the Anglo-Indian vocabulary of the British Army, much of which is already to be found in the works of Mr Kipling and other Anglo-Indian writers, has been drawn upon freely.'

Many Army slang words and phrases of 1914-18 are now forgotten, though it would seem that a very fair number will survive. As to the slang that arose in India, nearly all of it dates from the period of the Indian Mutiny or from the subsequent and constant occupation of India by the British Army. Perhaps the only words that are at least a century old are *wallah* and some of its compounds. Meaning man, fellow, the word appears in print as early as 1776 as *Agra-wallah*, a native of Agra; as *patriot-wallah* in 1785. In 1914-18 *wallah* usually designated an officer with a specific job, as e.g. a *Lewis Gun wallah*. One occasionally heard the phrase *an amen-wallah*, a clergyman, especially a chaplain, but originally a chaplain's clerk; this compound may have been formed by some scholarly soldier who knew the eighteenth-century *amen-curler*, a parish clerk. The usual army word for a parson was, of course, *padre*, which, from Latin *pater*, is in three Romance languages the title applied to the regular clergy, and in India, via the Portuguese,

to a minister or priest of any Christian religion ; hence, a chaplain in either the army or the navy. Apparently the word first appeared in English literature in 1584, but it was two centuries, or more, before it became frequent in the relevant sense.

Bad Bargain has long been in general slang use for a bad soldier, and its general application to any disadvantageous arrangement dates back to the sixteenth century. Not at any time much used by soldiers, it was originally the *King's bad bargain* ; in 1785, Grose, the soldier antiquary and lexicographer, defines thus : 'a malingerer, a soldier who shirks his duty.' The same authority has the common army and civilian work *beak*, 'a justice of peace, or magistrate' ; the word occurs in Harman's 'Caveat for Common Cursitors' in 1573 as *beck* ; yet probably it is connected with *beak*, a bird's bill, and, like so much early cant (the slang of thieves and other criminals, gipsies and other vagrants and vagabonds), was perhaps due to those university men who ran wild in London : I suggest that *beck*, as an anglicized form of the French *bec*, is basically the same as, and afterwards became, *beak*. *Binge*, in pre-War days an Oxford University word for a drinking bout, was developed by the soldiers to mean, in the words of Mr Brophy's compilation, 'an expedition deliberately undertaken in company for the purpose of relieving depression, celebrating an occasion, or a spasm of high spirits, by becoming intoxicated. But music and singing are essentially part of a binge. More an officer's word than a private soldier's.' In 1914-18 the word was usually a noun, rarely a verb ; it appears in neither 'The New Oxford Dictionary' nor Weekley's 'Etymological Dictionary.'* The word may be due to a confusion and combining of the Lincolnshire *binge*, to soak,† and the cant *bingo*, defined as 'brandy or other spirituous liquor' by Grose, who has also *bingo mort*, cant for a female dram-drinker, and *bingo boy*, cant for a male dram-drinker ; as Brophy (*l.c.*) points out, the latter term is interesting 'in view of *The Bing Boys*, a very

* After this : 'The Oxford' ; Weekley.

† Cf. the sea-slang phrase, *to binge a cask*, 'to get the remaining liquor from the wood by rinsing it with water.' ('Sea Slang,' by Frank C. Bowen, 1930.)

popular musical comedy in 1916-17 which made famous the song, "Another little drink wouldn't do us any harm." Dr Murray in 1888 suggested that *bingo* was *b* (for *brandy*) and *stingo*; very diffidently I suggest that a Lincolnshire wit gave to *binge*, to soak, the termination *o* (after deleting *e*) on the analogy of the much older slang *stingo* (from *sting*), strong ale or beer, apparently first used in print and perhaps coined by Randolph about 1635. Another civilian slang word, *bitch*, to spoil, ruin, was vigorously adopted by the soldier; this sense is modern, but it probably derives from the eighteenth-century use, to hang back.

As one would expect, the idea of theft and illicit acquisition forms a significant group of soldiers' slang words: *bone*, *make*, *nab*, *nail*, *pinch*, *scrounge*, *snaffle*, *win*, to mention only those which originated before 1830. *Bone* is very inadequately treated in 'the Oxford,' for in the fifth edition of Dyche's illuminating 'Dictionary,' 1748, we read that it is 'a cant word, to seize or arrest; also to cheat or strip a person of his money or goods,' while Grose, 1788, defines *boned* as 'seized, apprehended, taken up by a constable. Cant'; in 1914-18 the verb meant either to steal (or merely borrow with no very firm intention of restoring) or to arrest. The origin is dubious: it may be a figure of speech based on a dog's removal of a bone to a place of safety, or a corruption of *bonnet* (a gambling shark), or again a sense-development of that literal meaning, to deprive of the bone, to take the bones from, which has been current since the fifteenth century: the second theory is improbable, for it implies a pun (*to bonnet*, to bone it) that requires the already-existent use of *bone*—to take an important part of, thence to take the whole: whereby we cursorily indicate the probable origin, for the dog-metaphor explanation seems very thin. *Make*, likewise thieves' cant, appears in B. E.'s 'Dictionary of the Canting Crew,' 1690-1700, and again in Grose, in the modern sense, to steal; the word implied cunning or skill in the acquiring. *Nab*, established early in the seventeenth century, is cant and dialectal for to seize a person or to steal a thing, though in its early days it had, in many phrases, the more general senses to take, receive, get; in cant, *to nab the stoop* signified to stand in the pillory. *Nail* was used both for

to take without hesitation and to steal. Chaucer had it to signify simply to take; in the eighteenth century the verb denoted securing, 'fixing' an offer; Vaux in 1819 records it, 'to nail is to rob or steal'; in this last sense the word is either low slang or thieves' cant. *Pinch* in 1914-18 likewise meant to arrest or to steal; both senses were current in thieves' slang in the seventeenth century. *Scrounge* is one of the most famous War words: both the name and the thing were excessively common, and one said *on the scrounge*, on the look-out for anything materially advantageous, and *to scrounge*, 'to steal, not personal belongings, but from a department or some other embodiment of authority. More army property changed hands by *scrounging* than by legitimate means. Also used intransitively *to scrounge about*, to go seeking an opportunity of stealing, either a particular article or whatever fortune offered' (Brophy, *l.c.*). The word is not in Hotten, nor in Farmer and Henley; Weekley and 'the Oxford' are, unintentionally, a little vague; the real solvent is supplied by the late and much lamented Joseph Wright, who, in his 'English Dialect Dictionary,' makes it clear that it is a North Country word, that one of the secondary meanings is 'to wander about idly,' and that one of the meanings of the noun is 'a thorough search.' A *scrounger*, which I believe to be a War-time neologism, is of course an adept at this valuable art. *Snaffle*, to steal, was defined by Hotten as to arrest, but this sense is obsolete. 'The New Canting Dictionary,' 1725, says: 'To steal, to rob, to purloin,' but that the word was in use considerably earlier may be inferred from the fact that already in 1700 a *snaffler* was a highwayman. Noun and verb are definitely cant. *Win*, to steal, is almost certainly cant, and it appears as such at the end of the seventeenth century in B. E.'s dictionary; Grose also gives it.

Some of the best known Army slang words concern food; old friends like *pahny*, *rooty*, and the other Anglo-Indians, are not yet old enough to be admitted here. Whether *pozzy* merits inclusion is an open point. This frequently used word for jam is a mystery: for though it was certainly in use by 1884, before jam became an article of ration issue, and began its English career as a Regular Army word, we do not know its age, nor its origin. It comes from neither Hindustani nor Arabic, the two

most fertile foreign sources of Regular Army slang. Some of the best authorities suggest a West Indian origin; others that it is from a South African language.* Very tentatively I suggest *posset*, by a corruption of spelling and a diversion of the meaning; or rather, I suggest that an Englishman, hearing a native word for some mixture resembling either a very thick, sweet posset or a thin, watery jam, applied the name *posset* and that, conscious of the twisted meaning of a good old word, those who used *posset* for near-jam, then by a natural transition for jam, sympathetically debased the form of the word. I put forward that purely semantic theory in the hope that some one who really does know will come forward and solve the problem. With *burgoo* (often corrupted to *burgue*), porridge, we are on safer ground. Curiously enough, the word was, in dialect, obsolete before 1897, but it survived in the Regular Army and had a very vigorous life in 1914-18. Weekley records the probably artificial spelling *burgoût* (gallomania this!) in 1743; 'the Oxford' gives an instance of *burgoo* in 1750. It was at first a sailors' word, 'the Oxford' preferring not to risk an etymology, Weekley being cautious with '? Arab *burghul*, wheat dried and boiled'; Mr T. E. Shaw (to give his less famous name now adopted by deed-poll) says: 'from *burghul*, Turkish and Arabic for wheat-porridge.' *Jippo* was meat-juice (especially bacon-fat or gravy) and occasionally butter. As nautical slang in 1870, *jipper* denoted gravy; *bread and jipper*, bread and dripping; and *jipper* as verb, to baste a bird or a joint of meat. In London and the Isle of Wight, in 1902, it could mean the juice or the syrup of a pie, a pudding. In the modern form *jippo* or *gippo*, it is ignored by 'the Oxford.' The nearest that I can get to an etymology is *gippo*, a scullion (seventeenth to eighteenth century); and that is only a guess, although the transition from a scullion to a 'constant culinary feature' needs only to be authenticated to be declared obvious. But it is more likely that the original form was *jipper*, a nautical word picked up one knows not where, and that the *jippo-jippo*

* An old soldier at the Royal Hospital, Chelsea, says that *pozzy* was used by South African natives in talking to soldiers, to signify any sort of sweetmeat or preserve. I owe this information to Brig.-General A. P. Wavell, C.M.G., M.C.

form is due to the frequent use of *gyppo* (*gippo*), *jippo*, as variants of *gyppy*, *gippy*, *gippie* for an Egyptian. The general word for food was *scan*, employed also to designate a meal. Messrs Fraser and Gibbons in 'Soldier and Sailor Words and Phrases,' 1925, say that it is a Navy word, and Frank C. Bowen (*l.c.*) tersely defines thus: '*Scan*. Naval food.' The word certainly dates back in the Regular Army, however, to about 1860: several staff officers have written to say that they think the Army used it considerably before that year. Weekley suggests that *scan* is cognate with *scrannel*, lean, meagre. Grose in his remarkable *Vulgar Tongue* (1785) simply says 'victuals.' The probable genesis is: refuse; broken victuals; an impromptu meal; food. *Scan-bag* was military slang for a haversack at least as early as 1864, as Hotten's Dictionary proves. *Tommy* was likewise used for food in general, but originally it meant bread; it is a Regular Army word. *Brown George*, defined by Grose as 'an ammunition loaf,' arose in the previous century to designate a coarse brown loaf; there may possibly be a pun* suggested by *brown musket* (seventeenth century), *brown Bess* (eighteenth century). *Brown Tommy* is apparently a late eighteenth-century variation on *Brown George*, and it soon became alternatively *Tommy Brown*, then it shortened to *Tommy*, thence *tommy*; as early as 1783, according to Cobbett, *tommy* signified brown bread; at Chatham, he adds, white bread was just 'bread.' Grose, in 1788, glosses *tommy* thus: 'White Tommy; bread is so called by sailors to distinguish it from biscuit.'

Of the various Army terms of address, *chum* and *cobber* are the most interesting. Among English troops, *chum* was slightly more popular than *mate*, and much more popular than *pal*, while among the Australians *cobber* shared the honours with *digger* (from the early gold-rush days). *Chum* arose in the seventeenth century, when it designated intimates at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge: 'The Dictionary of a Canting Crew' defines it as 'a chamber-fellow, or constant companion.'

* Aided by the fact that *brown George* was, in the Navy, a name for bread supplied by contract and more 'officially' known as *munition bread* (Bowen, *l.c.*).

Originally quite good English, it rapidly degenerated; Johnson has it; Grose remarks: 'a chamber-fellow, particularly at the universities and in prison.' *Cobber* itself does not, I believe, date before 1850, and the absence of any definite clue in such authorities as 'the Oxford' and Weekley, Hotten and Farmer and Henley, rather frightened me, for I did not wish to hide behind 'apparently an obscure Australianism,' for this *cobber* has obviously nothing to do with *cobber*, a great lie (cf. a whopping or a rapping lie). Joseph Wright's Dictionary offers two possibilities: the Cornish *cobba*, a simpleton, a bungler, may have been transported to Australia and corrupted to its present spelling and meaning; or, more likely, it is a development from *cob* (originally Suffolk dialect), to take a liking to. One said to *click* for something good, to *click* something bad, i.e. to come in for; intransitively, to *click* meant to strike up a temporary acquaintance with a girl (who could likewise use the word). In eighteenth-century cant, *click* signified to snatch, whence came the sense to seize, to catch.

Clicking with a girl might lead to the less pleasant acquaintance with the *cage*, *clink*, *jankers*, *jug*, or *quod*, all of which, of course, are adoptions from civilian 'low slang.' *Cage* dates from the late fifteenth century; Shakespeare uses it in 1593; in the seventeenth century it was still good English; Johnson defined it as 'a prison for petty malefactors'; soon after, it became slang; by about 1850 it had reached the lowliest status of all, cant. In 1914-18, when so much of the lowest stratum of language came to the surface, it did duty for a barbed-wire enclosure for prisoners of war and, though this is loose and exceptional, for prison. *Clink* was the guard-room when and as it held offenders prior to trial. As early as 1515, Barclay used it of the famous prison in Southwark; thence—though the converse may have been true—it seems to have been applied to other prisons; in respect of the converse we may note that Grose suggests as the origin: 'the clinking of prisoners' chains or fetters,' but another possibility is the old verb *clink*, to fasten securely. *Jankers* * meant primarily punishment cells, secondarily defaulters' punishment and even 'the

* In the Navy: defaulters.

Defaulters,' i.e. the defaulters' bugle-call. (Whence *the jankers king*, the provost-sergeant.) I suspect the word of being very old, but I cannot prove this. As the obvious sources disclose no evidence, I conjecture a cant *janglers*, chains, corrupted to *jankers* partly because of the name, and the sense of *clink*. *Jug*, either a military prison staffed by 'Red Caps' or else a regimental guard-room, is the abbreviation of *stone-jug*,* which first, according to certain authorities, occurs in 1834 in Harrison Ainsworth's 'Rookwood'; but Ainsworth pillaged Grose at every turn: Grose in 1796 has '*Stone Jug*. Newgate, or any other prison.—*Stone Tavern*. Ditto,' two terms lacking in the first and second editions (1785, 1788), which, however, have the variant *stone-doublet*. All the three terms belong to cant. *Quod*, 'perhaps originally the quadrangle of the prison' (Weekley), is first recorded ca. 1700 in the 'Dictionary of the Canting Crew': '*Quod*. Newgate; also any prison, tho' for debt'; it may rather be connected with *qued*, *quad*, bad, evil—a wicked person—the Devil—evil, harm. In 1914–18 *quod* denoted either a military prison or a term of imprisonment. *Clink*, *jug*, and *quod* were also used as verbs signifying to imprison, the length of the sentence having little to do with it except that *jug* was the most serious and forbidding term.

Swing the lead, to malingering, a figurative use of the old nautical term: the sailor thus engaged had an excellent chance of 'taking things easy' and of wasting time. *Dodge the column* was a little more specific, for it meant to avoid a dangerous or some otherwise particularly unpleasant job; the phrase, in use during the Boer War, probably originated during the Peninsular War. The true *foot-slogger*, or infantryman, did neither. This term is comparatively modern, but its type is found in Grose, who defines a *foot-wabler* (i.e. foot-wobbler) as 'a contemptuous term for a foot soldier, frequently used by those of the cavalry.' One heard also in 1914–18 the variants *gravel-grinder* (cf. the French *pousse-caillou*, a pebble-pusher), *beetle-crusher*, *mud-crusher*, and *worm-crusher*; though these four terms were already current in the 1890's, I do not know just how much further back they go; *beetle-crusher*, however, is a development of the

* Cf. the old Navy term *stone-frigate*, a naval gaol.

same term (variant, *beetle-squasher*) in the sense of a large, flat foot—'the expression,' says Hotten, 'was made popular by being once used by Leech,' and *mud-crusher* is recorded by Hotten as 'a word of contempt, used by the cavalry in reference to the infantry'; with this last, compare the eighteenth-century *officer of feet*, 'a jocular title for an officer of infantry.' The commonest German slang words for an infantryman (*Infanterist*) are *Dreckfresser* and *Kilometerfresser*, mud- and kilometre-glutton; *Fusslatsche*, foot-shuffler, cf. Grose's *foot-wabler*; *Kilometerschwein*; *Lakenpatscher*, something like our *mud-crusher*; and *Sandhase*, literally sand-hare (i.e. in literary German, white hare).

The best of soldiers considered that they had a right to *grouse*, a word used by Kipling in 1892. Professor Weekley, contrary to 'the Oxford,' thinks it 'impossible to link the military *grouse* with Old French *groucier*, as there is a gap of centuries between them'; this is not to imply that there is no connection, for the 'missing links' will probably be found, perhaps in such words as *grudge* and the American *grouch*. The Naval equivalents of *grouse* as noun are *bleat* and *moan*. The worst *grouse* sometimes came from the soldier with the most *guts*, the germ-sense of which is 'substance' as in *to have guts in one's brain*, as used by Butler in 1663 and Swift somewhat later. But any kind of soldier liked *jam on it*, i.e. something pleasant, a luxury, surplus, unexpected windfall. *All jam*, at least as early as 1882—*real jam* in 'Punch,' 1885—and *jam and fritters* in Mary Kingsley, 1895, all meaning 'a real treat,' are probable parents, while an ancestor is to be found in the adjective *sweet*, defined by Grose as 'easy to be imposed on, or taken in; also expert dexterous, clever.'

Kamerad, literally comrade, is the famous German entreaty for mercy.* The word itself has a strong literary flavour, as we see, for example, in Grose's definition of *camerade*: 'A chamber-fellow; a Spanish military term. Soldiers were in that country divided into chambers, five men making a chamber, whence it was generally used to signify companion.' Analogous is the

* In surrendering to French soldiers, the Germans would say: *kamerade, pas kapout* (François Déchelette, 'L'Argot des Poilus,' 1918).

French *chambrée*, a military mess or a barrack-room. *Kip* meant to sleep; also a bed, any place in which to sleep, and sleep itself.* Probably the word was originally thieves' slang; 'the Oxford' gives 'a common lodging-house; also a lodging or bed in such a house; hence, a bed in general,' and says that the origin is uncertain, but Weekley appears to have solved the difficulty by finding the etymology in the Danish *kippe*, a mean hut, an ale-house. The soldier's *pack* was more properly called valise, officially knapsack, and, in its other sense, his full equipment: the second meaning has been influenced by the connotation, a heap or lot of things, dating from Shakespeare; the former derives from a *pedlar's pack*, and may be found in Spenser's 'Shepherd's Calendar.'

If the soldier's kip were notably dirty, or his pack just perceptibly irregular, the sergeant-major (*the Major*), who would be sure to have him *taped*, would speak to some purpose. Occasionally tapes were laid in the open to indicate the 'jump-off' of an attack: hence 'Jerry has got us taped' signified that the Germans had the exact range; while 'the S.M. has that bleeder taped' implied a fear that some ranker was unfavourably sized-up by that important person. After disposing of the offender, the S.M. might be glad to go to *Wypers*, a pronunciation of Ypres encouraged by the powers at the very beginning of the War, perhaps as a reminiscence of the Ypre Tower (locally Wypers) at Rye, the old Cinque port that naturally had close business relations with Flanders. The surnames *Wiper* and *Wypers* also represent Ypres, as, though less obviously, do *Diaper* and *Dipper*.

Two phrases much heard in 1917-18 were *old soldier* and *old sweat*, the latter properly denoting a Regular Army man, the former a soldier (whether a Regular or not) who carried his experience to the point of cunning and his cunning to the verge of malingering. *Old soldier*, printed as a verb in 1892, has not caught on; it is an embroidering of *Come the old soldier over*, which we find in Scott's 'St. Ronan's Well,' 1824. *To soldier*, usually in the form *soger*, is in Dana's 'Two Years before the Mast,' 1840, in the sense of malinger, shirk one's job, and it has remained a nautical term to this day: Bowen

* In nautical slang, a hammock, bunk, or sleep (Bowen, *l.c.*).

defines *sogering* as 'loafing, acting like a soldier on ship-board.' The same authority records *soldier* as a term of contempt applied to any inferior seaman, a *soldier's mast* for a pole mast without sails, *soldier-walking* for any land operations carried out by bluejackets; while Grose has *soldier's bottle*, a large one, and *soldier's pomatum*, a piece of tallow candle. *An old soldier* is now synonymous with a shirker, a malingerer, or an 'artful dodger.'

Over the top the soldier, however 'old,' had to go if he belonged to the infantry; the phrase, varied to *over the bags*, may be compared with the old-warfare *into the breach*, i.e. enter the gap made by a battery in the enemy's fortification (*to stand in the breach* was the defender's part); both phrases became metaphors. As the man *hopped the bags*, he hoped that this would be a good *show*, by which he would convey an attack, a raid. *Show* often meant a bombardment or a local engagement, *push* connoting an attack on a wide front. *Push* was employed in a frontal instead of a lateral sense by Napier in his 'Peninsular War' in 1828: 'making a "push" of 400 miles'; by Napier's day *push* had become obsolete in its early military meaning of an attack or vigorous onset, as in Golding's translation of Cæsar, 1563, and in Earl Orrery's 'Art of War,' 1677. The history of *show* is not so clear. As 'a demonstration or display of military strength or of intention to take severe measures,' to quote 'the Oxford' definition, the word has persisted from the middle of the sixteenth century. This meaning is linked up with that of a 'display on a large scale,' which we see in such a statement as 'the battalion put up a damned good show.' Those who returned from a successful attack would hope for, and do their best to *wangle*, leave. *Wangle* is modern, 1888 being the first 'printed' date; the origin is obscure, but the word was probably by *new-fangled* out of *waggle*.

The French soldiers' slang is as vivid as our own. Indeed the *poilu* was a smart fellow, and his nickname was known to many. *Poilu* was used of a soldier by Balzac in 1834, the word dating back much further. Its history is, in fact, less disputed than that of the English *Tommy*, which everybody knows is short for *Tommy Atkins*, more formally *Thomas Atkins*. George Augustus Sala in 1883 spoke of 'Private Tommy Atkins, returning from Indian

service,' and Kipling of 'Tommy' in 1892. Like 'John and Richard Doe,' and like the earlier 'John-a-Nokes' and 'Tom-a-Stiles' (who died of obsolescence about 1760), Thomas Atkins is a formal name; it was first used, probably quite casually, in the specimen forms given in the War Office's Orders and Regulations of Aug. 31, 1815; and in the war of 1914-18 the Canadians had, in their pay-books, a specimen will with this name of *Thomas Atkins*. The eloquent 'story' by the late Lieut-Col Newnham-Davis, writing for the Royal Society of St George, is wrong about the date of the first official use of the name, but I am assured, by an eminent authority on military history, that there was an actual Thomas Atkins, who died in action in Holland in 1794 and that his commanding officer was young Colonel Wellesley. 'He was,' writes this correspondent, 'a member of the 33rd Regiment of Foot which is now the 1st Battalion of the Duke of Wellington's Regiment (West Riding). He stood six foot three and is possibly the source of *every inch a soldier*,' on the analogy, one assumes, of Shakespeare's 'every inch a king' ('Lear,' IV, vi). A much less significant word is *swaddy*, sometimes heard in 1914-18, as a term of address among soldiers, more often as meaning a private soldier. The eighteenth-century forms were *swadkin* and *swad-gill* with the basic or abbreviated *swad*.

One of the most picturesque of War terms is *No Man's Land*. Originally it denoted waste ground, barren stretches between two kingdoms or provinces. An official Roll of the year 1320 contains *nonesmanneslond*; Defoe in 1719 writes it *no Man's Land*, T. Hughes in 1881 *noman's land*, Dilke in 1890 *no-man's land*, 'The Month' in 1892 *no-man's-land*; 'the Oxford' prefers the uncapitalised *no man's land*. It was in this area between the aligned trenches that many a man *copped a packet*, gave up his *cold-meat ticket*, became a *landowner*, and began to *push up daisies*, when, in finer words, he *went west*. In *cop a packet*, *cop* (now slang) is probably a dialectal form of *cap*, the obsolete verb to seize, from old French *caper*, to seize, and *packet* often has, and long has had, the meaning of a packet of lies or something else that is unpleasant as in *to sell some one a packet*; *to cop a packet* probably began by indicating the reception of the unpleasantness; at first in 1914-18 it connoted to be

either wounded or killed, but it soon came to signify only the latter. A *cold-meat ticket* is one of those brutally-cynical yet inherently courageous terms which characterised the Tommy's speech: it refers to his identity disc. It is formed on the analogy of *cold-meat box*, a coffin, itself an extension of *cold-meat*, a corpse, as in Tom Moore's slangy 'Tom Crib,' 1819. *To become a landowner* is to be dead and buried, the estate being the grave; *a landowner in France* was often heard in place of 'Killed on the Western Front.' The metaphor is presumably old in its idea, but modern in its phrasing. *To push up daisies* is a War-time phrase, but *to turn up one's toes to the daisies* occurs in Barham's 'Ingoldsby Legends,' 1837. This figure for post-mortem burial and its finality was probably, in some form or other, coined before Barham's time. *To go west* in the seventeenth century described the passage of the condemned criminal from Newgate to Tyburn, where, in that part of London nowadays called Marylebone, stood the great gallows known as Tyburn Tree (Weekley, 'Adjectives and other Words,' 1930). This I believe to be the operative origin of the phrase, though romantic associations have enriched it and impregnated it with something of awe and suffused it with much of sentiment: the image of the sun setting in the west, the metaphor of the day there going to its death, as in the Greek proverb, *ὁ βίος ἔσπεραν ἄγει* (life draws towards its evening, the west, the setting sun); and the journeying westwards of the pioneers in North America, the long trail that often led to peril and death. The metaphor began in English literature at the beginning of the fifteenth century ('it was night, the sun goeth west'), in the sixteenth it gathered force with its transference to human beings ('55 women . . . are gone west'), in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it gained an admixture of violence (death by hanging), in the nineteenth the Americans revived the phrase, and in the twentieth we have seen too many of our friends meet their death: westering to the dark that light might come.

ERIC PARTRIDGE.

Art. 11.—STRAFFORD

1. *Strafford*. By Lady Burghclere. Two vols. Macmillan, 1931.
2. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford*. By S. R. Gardiner. (Ap. D.N.B.) Smith Elder, 1899.
3. *Letters and Despatches of the Earl of Strafford*. Two vols. Edited by W. Knowler, with Biographical notes by Sir G. Radcliffe. London, 1739.
4. *Strafford*. By H. D. Traill. Macmillan, 1889.
5. *The Tryal of the Earl of Strafford*. Edited by John Rushworth. London, 1700.
6. *Papers Relating to Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford*. Edited by C. H. Firth. (The Camden Miscellany, Vol. ix), 1890.
7. *Life of Strafford*. By Robert Browning. With an Introduction by C. H. Firth. Kegan Paul, 1892.

IN the great panorama of English History there are few figures more arresting than that of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. 'Black Tom Tyrant' to his enemies—and they were many—he was to his friends the personification of all that is steadfast, strong and lovable. A man of striking presence and ancient lineage; among a group of exceptionally able men, in talent pre-eminent; hot-tempered but not vindictive; impatient of inefficiency and a foe to corruption; undeviating in the pursuit of objects which to him seemed supremely important; more apt to bear down opposition than to appease unfriendly critics; one who under another sky, and under circumstances more congenial to his temper and talents, might have played the part of a Warren Hastings, a Dalhousie or a Richelieu; the leader of the parliamentary opposition to an incompetent minister; careful to maintain consistency of principle but indifferent to the charge of disloyalty to party; an ardent if too impatient reformer of abuses; the friend of the poor and the protector of the weak, but ruthless in the punishment of powerful offenders; pursued to his tragic end by influential enemies; deserted by the master he had served devotedly, and might perchance have saved; an outstanding, heroic, and romantic figure in the greatest tragedy ever played on the stage of English History—such was Strafford. Pym, with

unerring instinct, fixed on him as the arch-enemy to all for which the leaders of the Long Parliament stood; Essex pronounced on him the grim sentence 'stone-dead hath no fellow.' Had Strafford been suffered to survive he might have saved the monarchy; his judicial murder was the measure of the power his enemies descried in him. It is little wonder, therefore, that posterity should have been anxious to probe the secrets of a career so crowded and conspicuous, but superficially so contradictory.

Suspense has intensified curiosity. It is nearly half a century since Dr Samuel Rawson Gardiner was impelled to express his regret that he had been denied access to the Strafford manuscripts preserved at Wentworth Woodhouse. Lady Burghclere has been fortunate enough to surmount the barrier which so long baffled her predecessors; and the result is that at long last we possess a full-length portrait of Strafford—the man and the statesman. If we have waited long, we have not waited in vain. Lady Burghclere has utilised her opportunity with eminent tact and skill. That her volumes add much to our knowledge of Strafford's political career cannot be said. Dr Knowler, the learned editor of Strafford's 'Letters and Despatches,' seems to have left little for subsequent gleaners in the political field; but Lady Burghclere has printed a number of letters which have not before seen the light, and enable us to appreciate the character of the man as it has never until now been fully appreciated. Not even by Robert Browning. Yet it is a striking testimony to the insight of the poet that he should have pierced to the heart of the man's character, even if he failed to apprehend, or at any rate to interpret, his political principles.*

' Wherefore not feel sure
That Time who in the twilight comes to mend
All the fantastic day's caprice, consign
To the low ground once more the ignoble Term
And raise the genius on his orb again—
That Time will do me right.'

Strafford's confidence in the judgment of posterity has been justified. Thanks to Dr Gardiner, Mr Traill, Sir

* I refer not to the Play where poetic and dramatic licence are of course permissible, but to Browning's 'Prose Life of Strafford.'

Charles Firth, and not least to Lady Burghclere, we, of this generation, are at last in a position to appreciate both the beauty of Strafford's character, his greatness as an administrator, and the purity of his political aims.

Yet it must not be forgotten that a whole generation of historical students was content to accept the superficial and grossly prejudiced verdict of Macaulay, and there is reason to fear that for one person who has now learnt the truth from Gardiner and his disciples, there are hundreds whose opinion of the 'Great Apostate' has been unalterably fixed by the magic of Macaulay's pen. But is there an educated, or even a fair-minded, person who can read the following passage without a sense of indignation and disgust?—

'For his accomplices,' wrote Macaulay in his Essay on Hallam, 'various excuses may be urged, ignorance, imbecility, religious bigotry. But Wentworth had no such plea. His intellect was capacious. His early prepossessions were on the side of popular rights. He knew the whole beauty and value of the system which he attempted to deface. He was the first of the Rats, the first of those statesmen whose patriotism has been only the coquetry of political prostitution, and whose profligacy has taught governments to adopt the old maxim of the slave-market, that it is cheaper to buy than to breed, to import defenders from an Opposition than to rear them in a Ministry. He was the first Englishman to whom a peerage was a sacrament of infamy, a baptism into the communion of corruption. As he was the earliest of the hateful list, so was he also by far the greatest; eloquent, sagacious, adventurous, intrepid, ready of invention, immutable of purpose, in every talent which exalts or destroys nations pre-eminent, the lost Archangel, the Satan of the apostasy. The title for which, at the time of his desertion, he exchanged a name honorably distinguished in the cause of the people, reminds us of the appellation which, from the moment of the first treason, fixed itself on the fallen Son of the Morning,

"Satan:—so call him now—His former name
Is heard no more in heaven."

For a century and a quarter the 'Edinburgh Review' maintained the highest traditions of English criticism. It was true to the end to its original text: *Judex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur*, and it were ill becoming the

'Quarterly Review,' and least of all the present writer, to speak evil of the dead. But Macaulay's famous judgment on Strafford shows the Edinburgh Reviewer at his worst: arrogant, malignant and lacking in the sense of historical perspective. To a Victorian Whig Parliamentary institutions were *jure divino*; to cast doubts, even prenatal doubts, on the divine origin of Cabinet Government was to sin against the light. That a man who had been foremost in the vindication of the liberty of the subject, and in the assertion of parliamentary privileges, could also have believed in the imperative necessity of a strong executive, seems never to have dawned upon the intelligence of Lord Macaulay. Fidelity to party allegiance was the supreme merit. A man who could desert his 'Party' (even though the device of Party Government had not even been adumbrated) must necessarily be a traitor to his principles. Wentworth's apostasy must evidently have been purchased. A peerage was evidently the price.

The facts of Strafford's life are familiar and must be recalled here only in barest outline. Superstitious folk will not fail to note that Thomas Wentworth was born on a Friday—and that Good Friday—and on the 13th day of the month April, 1593: that his Viscounty was gazetted on the 13th of December, 1628; that he was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland on the 13th of January, 1632, and left Ireland for the last time on the 13th of April, 1640.* But let the superstitious make what they will of that. Wentworth's life though brief was far from unhappy; his career was exceptionally brilliant, and his end—truly that of a martyr—made him secure in the everlasting remembrance of men. Though born in London, at the house of his maternal grandfather Sir Robert Atkinson, in Chancery Lane, Thomas Wentworth was a thorough and typical Yorkshireman. The Wentworths had been lords of the noble domain of Wentworth Woodhouse for nearly three centuries when, in 1614, Thomas succeeded his father as second baronet. In his veins was the blood of Percies and Nevilles, not to mention that of Gascoigne, the famous Chief Justice. Educated at

* By a further coincidence Lady Burghclere's 'Life' was published on Friday, Mar. 13.

St John's College, Cambridge, Wentworth married, at the age of eighteen, Lady Margaret Clifford, the eldest daughter of Francis, Fourth Earl of Cumberland. He then proceeded to complete his formal education by foreign travel (December 1612—February 1614), and on his return was elected as member for Yorkshire, and sat in the 'addled' Parliament of 1614. In the following year he was appointed *Custos Rotulorum* for the West Riding, in place of Sir John Savile, afterwards First Baron Pontefract, and incurred the latter's life-long hostility by his refusal to surrender the post to him at Buckingham's instance, a few years later. Wentworth was appointed a member of the Council of the North in 1619, and in 1621 was again returned to Parliament as member for Yorkshire—again in opposition to Sir John Savile. The Parliament of 1621 was marked by an acute conflict between James I and the Commons on the question of Parliamentary privileges which, according to the King, were 'derived from the grace of our ancestors and us,' but were claimed by the Commons as of right. Wentworth shared neither the Puritan zeal nor the anti-Spanish prejudices of his colleagues, but in the assertion of the just liberties of Parliament he was second to none. He it was who proposed that a protest against their infraction should be entered on the Journals, and when James tore it out and dissolved Parliament, he lamented 'the disaster fallen upon this so hopeful a Parliament.' Thus early did he show himself, though anxious to avoid a breach with the Crown, a stout champion of Parliament. Nor did he, to the end, abandon his firm belief in Parliament as a valuable instrument of government in the hands of a wise and capable ruler.

In the last Parliament of the reign (1624) Wentworth, rejected in favour of Savile by the county of York, sat for the borough of Pontefract. The temporary alliance between Buckingham and the Commons, founded on common hostility to Spain, found no favour with Wentworth, highly as it delighted Puritan fanatics like Eliot. Yet he frequented 'opposition' circles, notably the house of Lord Clare, father of Denzil Holles and of the Lady Arabella. To the latter Wentworth, who had been for three years a widower, became deeply attached, and they were married in February 1625. The marriage

was ideally happy, and until it was dissolved by Lady Arabella's death in 1631, Wentworth was rarely absent from her side. A good husband to his first wife and to his third, Elizabeth Rodes, whom he married in 1632, it was to the Lady Arabella that Wentworth gave his passionate devotion. She was the mother of his 'sweet Will,' his only son, and of his favourite daughter 'Nan,' to whom in the most moving (to Macaulay a 'whimpering') passage of his final speech in Westminster Hall he alluded as those 'pledges that a saint in Heaven left me.' To his undying affection for her many of the most characteristic letters recovered by Lady Burghclere from Wentworth Woodhouse testify. Thus, four years after her death, he writes to an intimate friend: 'I do most humbly beseech God to enable me to become the father unto [my little ones] I desire and endeavour to be, and then I dare say never children had a better. When I look upon them I call to mind their mother than whose memory nothing in the whole world can ever be lodged in me with soe much dearness and reverence.' And this was the man whose private life, for all its purity and tenderness, was exposed, no less than his public life, to the shafts of malignant enemies.

Charles I succeeded his father in 1625, and to the first Parliament of the new reign Wentworth was again elected, with Sir Thomas Fairfax as his colleague, for the county of York, once more in opposition to the Saviles. But on petition he was unseated—a result due partly to his own tactless if not irregular behaviour in the House, and partly to the eloquence of Eliot, who coalesced with the courtiers, anxious to be avenged on the opponent of Buckingham, in condemnation of Wentworth. Yorkshire, however, re-elected him, and in the proceedings of this critical session he played a conspicuous part. In the theological disputes between Arminians and Puritans Wentworth was disinclined to meddle, but on general grounds of public expediency he opposed any relaxation of the Penal laws, and, though he took no part in the attacks on Buckingham, he strongly criticised both the object of his foreign policy and his administrative incompetence. 'What he could not forgive,' as Lady Burghclere justly observes, 'was muddle, inefficiency, corruption and maladministration generally. Buckingham blocked

the way to any reforms of importance, and still more to individual reformers, since neither his parasites nor his own vanity would suffer him to give an efficient personality room to do the work he could not himself achieve.' His attitude towards Buckingham is, we should observe, eminently characteristic of Wentworth's general attitude towards public affairs and, on that account, needs to be emphasised. How Buckingham regarded it is sufficiently indicated by the fact that, before the next Parliament met, Wentworth was pricked as Sheriff, and was thus disqualified from standing for his county. A few months later he was dismissed from his office as *Custos Rotulorum*—a dignity bestowed upon his rival Savile, upon whom other favours were presently heaped by Buckingham.

The King meanwhile was plunging deeper and deeper into difficulties, diplomatic and financial. Wentworth, to mark his disapproval of Buckingham's conduct of affairs, refused his contribution to the forced loan demanded by the King, and consequently found himself a prisoner in the Marshalsea. Though he was presently released, Sir Thomas Darnel and his fellow-knights were less fortunate. Their arbitrary detention was the proximate reason which led the House of Commons to press the Petition of Right. Of the House which formulated that famous declaration of constitutional liberties Wentworth was the undisputed leader. No more ardent champion of the liberty of the subject and the rights of Parliament had yet appeared. Eliot was more vehement; Coke was more erudite; Pym added to the acumen of a great parliamentary statesman the fervour of the Puritan. Yet to none of these was Wentworth inferior in his belief in Parliament as a valuable organ of government, while he was incomparably superior to them all in width of outlook, and firmness of grasp upon the intricacies of international politics. Not that width of outlook is always an asset to a statesman. The narrower intellect is apt to achieve more than the wider. Strafford, however, combined in unique degree, broad views of policy with a genius for administrative detail. Ireland was to prove it. But Ireland was not yet. On June 7, 1628, the King gave his assent to the Petition of Right; on July 22, Wentworth went to the House of Lords; on Aug. 23, Buckingham fell by the

hand of an assassin ; in December Wentworth became a Viscount and obtained a long-coveted appointment as President of the Council of the North, and a year later was admitted to the Privy Council. What was the explanation of this rapid improvement in his fortunes ? Had he indeed 'ratted' ? If so, how shall we excuse the 'Great Apostasy.' 'Much good wrath is thrown away,' wrote Robert Browning, 'upon what is usually called apostasy.' I respectfully agree. Nor was there in Wentworth's case either apostasy or conversion. Nevertheless, an explanation is called for. It would be easier to give it had Buckingham been removed a month before, instead of a month after Wentworth's promotion to the peerage. Yet the coincidence of Buckingham's removal and Wentworth's rapid rise is vital to a comprehension of Wentworth's political career.

With the Pym party he was never in more than partial sympathy. He shared their mistrust of Buckingham ; with them he lamented that the foolish King's confidence should be given to an incompetent favourite ; like them he believed that the safety of the State and the happiness and prosperity of the people depended on the maintenance of a good accord between the Sovereign and his subject ; not less than them he was convinced that Parliament was the appropriate, the regular and the constitutional instrument by which that accord might be maintained ; but beyond that he was not prepared to go. Let it be remembered that the seventeenth century was called upon to face two supreme issues, and, if it might be, to find a solution for the problems they raised. The first was political. Where did sovereignty reside ? In the King ; or in the people ; or in the King-in-Parliament ? Less philosophically but more precisely : who was to control the Executive ? King or Parliament ? The second problem was ecclesiastical : What was the true connotation of the 'Church.' Was it the nation on its ecclesiastical side ? If so (and none doubted that it was or should be) what rule was the Church to follow, Roman, Arminian, or Puritan ?

Wentworth, like his friend Laud, was a convinced Arminian, or to use the modern term Anglican, devoted to the *via media* which led neither to Rome nor to Geneva. Between him and the Pym and Eliots therefore, there

could be no whole-hearted sympathy. There might indeed be political cooperation. But only up to a point. Like Pym, Wentworth looked to Parliament for legislation, for the control of taxation, for keeping the King informed as to the state of public feeling, and so forth. But for Pym and Eliot that was not enough. They believed that the time had come for a great step forward in constitutional evolution; for the transference of the control of the Executive from Crown to Parliament. To such a step Wentworth was inflexibly opposed.

'The government by a single person and a Parliament is a Fundamental. It is the *esse*, it is Constitution.' So said Cromwell. 'The Executive part of Government . . . is wisely placed in a single hand by the British Constitution for the sake of unanimity, strength and dispatch. The King of England is, therefore, not only the chief but properly the sole magistrate of the nation.' So said Blackstone a hundred years after, 'Those statesmen who have been the most celebrated for the soundness of their principles and for the justness of their views have declared in favour of a single Executive.' So wrote Alexander Hamilton in the 'Federalist.'

Wentworth was in complete accord with Cromwell, with Blackstone, and with the Fathers of the American Constitution. The test of a good Constitution is the strength of the Executive. That a large and composite body of lawyers, squires, and merchants, should control the Executive was to Wentworth unthinkable. Pym had other views; a Cabinet was already in his mind, as he showed in the *Grand Remonstrance*; and Pym's view ultimately prevailed; but only after two Revolutions had been accomplished. Meanwhile, Wentworth got the desired opportunity of putting his views into practice; first in the Council of the North, and then in Ireland. By his government of the Northern counties and by his administration of Ireland Wentworth ought in fairness to be judged. He can stand the test; but who would ever guess from Lord Macaulay's venomous diatribe that Wentworth gave to the backward North, or to a barbarous Ireland, the supreme blessings of sound and strong and substantially just administration?

No attempt to substantiate this judgment in detail is

possible, be it regretfully admitted, within the limits of an essay. Those who would know the truth may be referred to Lady Burghclere's admirably discriminating narrative. In neither sphere of government was Wentworth's administration free from errors upon which hostile critics can easily enlarge. Lady Burghclere makes no attempt to palliate his faults of temper; but she does exhibit him as one whose rule, though bearing harshly on high-placed offenders, conduced to the well-being of the community as a whole, and was paternally protective of the poor and the weak. The north of England, far behind the south in those days, had not outgrown the need for Tudor discipline; Wentworth was determined to apply it, and to that end to maintain and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Council which was the appropriate instrument devised by the Tudors. But he would enlarge it, as he said, 'no further than shall be a covering to the common tranquillity and shelter to the poor and innocent from the proud and insolent.' The result of the inquiries which with Laud, Abbot, and Dorchester he was commissioned to make into the working of the Poor Law, was, according to the unimpeachable testimony of Miss Leonard, to inaugurate a 'more complete organisation for the help of the weaker classes than *at any other period of our history.*' (The italics are mine.) That Wentworth's firm administration of the law brought him into conflict with powerful law-breakers is undeniable. But he accepted all the consequences with serenity.

'When,' he wrote, 'I was employed at York in rating ye Fines of Knighthood I was libelled all over that part of ye Kingdome, for one, hung up in effigie with Empson and Dudley, for another my Lord Treasurer that was and myself painted upon Gibbets, our names underwritt with a great deale of poetry besides. These and other libellous cartels . . . were brought me by dozens.'

But he wisely refused to give the authors an advertisement. 'Thus did I quite spoil their feast. There was no noise at all of them went abroad . . .' He would, as he confessed, have acted very differently had 'these insolencies trenched upon the public.' 'Venom only cast out upon particulars' might safely be left to work its own cure. A severe visitation of the plague (1630-31)

gave him an opportunity of exhibiting both his wisdom and his courage. He insisted on remaining in his plague-stricken capital, and, by strictly enforcing sanitary measures and precautions, mortality was reduced to 50 per cent. 'The towne,' he wrote, 'takes much comfort in our staye here . . . and in good faith I should for my parte be very loathe to leave them in this distressed case.'

As in Yorkshire so in Ireland. He was appointed Lord Deputy in January 1632, but it was not until July 23, 1633 that he actually landed in Dublin. He had utilised the interval in making sure of his position in England, before proceeding to fulfil so perilous a mission, and in acquainting himself with the condition of things in Ireland. They could hardly have been worse. If the north of England was politically, socially and economically, a century behind the south, Ireland was at least three centuries behind the north of England. The root of half the ills from which, through long centuries, Ireland has suffered, is to be found in the fact that her Norman conquest, unlike that of England, came upon her at a time when she was neither ripe for conquest nor strong enough to repel it. The 'Pale' was the mischievous compromise dictated by the difficulties of a half-completed conquest. [Consequently Wentworth found tribalism and feudalism existing side by side. And worse. To the social mischiefs resulting from a half-completed conquest had been added in the sixteenth century the religious tragedy of a half-completed Reformation. To impose upon a Celtic and Catholic people an ecclesiastical establishment eminently characteristic of the English love of compromise, was a colossal blunder, if not a heinous crime. Almost as bad was the attempt—similarly inspired by that mixture of benevolence, complacency, and stupidity, which distinguishes our race—to establish in Ireland those parliamentary institutions which in England were the outcome of long training in self-government. But the relativity of the conclusions of Political Science is a lesson which we seem unable to learn either from philosophy or experience. 'The Teuton loves laws and Parliaments; the Celt loves a King.' Mr Goldwin Smith's oft-quoted aphorism may be too clear cut; but even if it be an over-hasty generalisation,

it contains a shrewd warning to the practical politician. Wentworth gave too little heed to it. Nevertheless, that he should have summoned Parliament at all in Ireland, even if he made it the instrument of his autocratic will, supplies an interesting commentary upon the consistency of his political views. He was, as we have seen, a genuine believer in Parliamentary institutions. The King was less sanguine than his Deputy, and warned him of the danger involved in his experiment. 'As for that hydra take good heed, for you know that here I have found it cunning as well as malicious.' And later: 'Parliaments are of the nature of cats, they ever grow curst with age; so that if ye will have good of them put them off handsomely when they come to any age, for young ones are ever most tractable.' Yet despite discouragement from his master the Lord Deputy persisted in his experiment, though he did not spare words of warning drawn from his unhappy experience in England.

'Let me advise you'—thus he addressed his first Parliament,—'suffer no poor suspicions or jealousies to vitiate your judgments, much rather become you wise by others' harms. You cannot be ignorant of the misfortunes these meetings have run of late years in England; strike not, therefore, upon the same rock of distrust which has so often shivered them. . . . Above all, divide not between the interests of the King and his people, as if there were one being of the King and another being of his people . . . you might as well tell me a head might live without a body, or a body without a head, as that it is possible for a King to be rich and happy, without his people be so likewise, or that a people can be rich and happy without the King be so also.'

These words are almost identical with those Wentworth addressed to his Council in York in 1628, and reflect, beyond question, his innermost and permanent convictions.

Nor was he wholly disappointed in the results of his difficult and doubtful experiment. His Parliament voted large supplies, and had he been suffered to remain at his post in Dublin, instead of being summoned to his doom in England, it is far from impossible that Ireland might have furnished the King with the support, financial and military, he so greatly lacked in his contest with the English and Scottish Puritans. But the discussion of 'ifs' is a pastime as dangerous as it is fascinating.

Whatever view be taken about Wentworth's parliamentary experiments, there can be no question that the creation of a strong and well-disciplined army was a prior necessity. Nor did the Lord Deputy neglect the task. With such promptitude and success did he achieve it that he was soon able to report to the English Privy Council that he had transformed a half-clothed, half-armed, undrilled, unpaid, ill-conducted rabble into an effective and orderly force. His own troop, on which he spent £6,000 out of his private purse, became in equipment and discipline a model for the whole army. He even made the English garrison popular in Ireland. 'Formerly they took the victuals and paid nothing as if it had been an enemy's country.' All that was changed. 'In the removes and marches the army paid justly for what they took, and passed along with civility and modesty as other subjects without burdens to the country through which they went.' Consequently, 'the soldier was now welcome in every place, where before they were an abomination to the inhabitants.'

As it was with the army, so it was with the administration of justice. Hitherto legal procedure in Ireland had been a byword for uncertainty and irregularity, not to say for gross corruption. Judges and juries were alike intimidated by local tyrants and influential bullies. Henceforward justice was to be dispensed, as Wentworth said, 'without acceptance of persons.' That in the process the Lord Deputy made many enemies among the great ones of the land is true. On the other hand: 'The poor knew where to seek and have relief without being afraid to appeal to his Majesty's Catholic justice against the greatest subject.' High and low alike were compelled to respect the law, and that, Wentworth adds, 'was a blessing to the poorer sort, a restraint the richer had not formerly been acquainted with in that kingdom . . . where they are as sharp set upon their own wills as any people in the world.'

Nothing called for Wentworth's wise head and strong hand more loudly than the state of religion. The great majority of the people remained true to Catholicism, though the English Government had done its best, if not to convert them to Protestantism, at least to compel them to outward conformity. The attempt was a miser-

able failure, and Wentworth found that though the old ecclesiastical order had been broken it had not been replaced. The churches were in ruins or put to base uses; church lands and endowments had been filched by powerful laymen; prelates and incumbents were pluralists and utterly neglectful of their spiritual duties; in fine, but for the defiance of the law by devoted Catholic priests, the people would for the most part have been left without religious consolations of any kind. In matters ecclesiastical, Wentworth was no more ahead of his times than other Englishmen; the State was in his view entitled to dictate the religion of its subjects and to punish those who refused to conform; but the Deputy would not fine people for not going to church until there were churches for them to go to. Sensible as this sounds, it was interpreted by the English Puritans as evidence of Wentworth's 'Romanising' sympathies. But he persisted: churches and schools were rebuilt; stolen church property was recovered; bishops and clergy were required to discharge their duties. All this did not please Pym. 'I hear nothing of spiritual edification,' he complained. 'They that strive not to build up Churches in a spiritual way of edification, let them build all the material churches there can be, they will do no good.' Convocation, however, rejoiced in the work accomplished by 'the most propitious Patron of this poor Church.'

The same zeal for order and efficiency inspired the policy of the Deputy in material affairs: in finance, trade, and commerce. The Irish Seas were cleared of the pirates who had infested them; custom duties and taxes were collected with regularity; the burden on Industry was eased, but the King's revenue was increased; the growing of flax was encouraged and a beginning was made in the manufacture of linen—the one industry that has flourished in Ireland from that day to this. 'No such series of wise and beneficial laws had ever been enacted in Ireland.' Such is Dr Gardiner's summary of the work of Wentworth's first Parliament. It has a wider application. Nor is the motive of his reforming activity obscure. '... The welfare of the people no less than that of the Sovereign. Their twin prosperity was the theme of all his discourses, the aim of all his measures, helped forward by the indignation aroused in

him by any tale of wrong or oppression to the poor.' The words are Lady Burghclere's.

Wentworth had the defects of his qualities. Conscious of the purity of his ends he was careless as to means. His hand was heavy on the Clanricardes, the Corks, the Wilmots, on men like Lord Chancellor Loftus and Lord Mountnorris. Laud warned him of the risks he ran: 'if you could find a way to do all these great services and decline these storms I mind it would be excellent well thought out.' But of his own interests Wentworth was careless.

'It was not anything within but the necessity of His Majesty's Service which enforced me into a seeming strictness outwardly. For where I found a Crown, a Church, and a people spoiled, I could not imagine to redeem them from under the pressure with gracious smiles and gentle looks; it would cost warmer water to do so.'

'Rose-water surgery' (to use Carlyle's phrase) was not Cromwell's method in Ireland; nor was it Wentworth's. But while Cromwell's work was mainly destructive, Wentworth's was wholly constructive. 'If his government had not been tainted by a sinister object he would have proved decisively that the temporary rule of a beneficent despot was the remedy required by the maladies of the country.' Thus Professor Goldwin Smith. Was Wentworth's object 'sinister'? That is the crucial question. Unless my reading of Wentworth's career and character is wholly at fault, the idea that he went to Ireland with the deliberate object of providing his master with resources and troops for the subjugation of England, would seem to be simply fantastic; the malignant invention of panic-stricken enemies, who were determined to secure his conviction and compass his death.

I anticipate events; but the story of the intervening years must be very briefly told: the more briefly since most writers on this period have given it disproportionate if not exclusive prominence. Wentworth and Laud are commonly reckoned as the twin accomplices of Charles I. in the attempt to establish despotism in England. That is grossly unfair to Wentworth. Between 1629 and 1638 he took no part in directing general policy; he was fully occupied in Yorkshire and in Ireland. By 1638 the

King's affairs were hopelessly entangled. England was not unprosperous, but the personal government of Charles and Laud in State and Church was becoming increasingly unpopular. Scotland was preparing to oppose Episcopacy by force. Wentworth, still in Dublin, strongly advised the King not to draw the sword until the Scots forced him to do so in defence of England: but it was only in September 1639, after the first 'Bishop's war,' that he was admitted to the inner counsels of the King, and became officially his chief adviser. His advice was eminently characteristic: summon Parliament, and meanwhile raise a loan from Privy Councillors. He himself headed the loan with £20,000. In January 1640 he became Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Earl of Strafford, and Baron Raby of Raby—a property which belonged to Sir Harry Vane, who against Strafford's advice was appointed to the secretaryship vacated by Sir John Coke. Strafford's tactless assumption of the Raby title gave deep and not unnatural offence to Vane, and in Clarendon's judgment cost Strafford his head. Be that as it may, this much is certain: Vane was responsible, whether in malice or folly, for the sudden dissolution of the Short Parliament, and, by his carelessness, if nothing worse, for the existence of the evidence which finally sealed the fate of Strafford. In the sworn secrecy of the Privy Council Strafford had reminded his Sovereign: 'You have an army in Ireland you may employ here to reduce this kingdom.' Intended by Strafford to apply to Scotland, with which at the moment Charles was at war, these words were distorted by his accusers to establish a charge of high treason against the King and Kingdom of England. For the record of them, the malice and carelessness of the elder Vane was responsible; it was his son who by accident, or his father's design, discovered them and produced them to incriminate the great apostate.

The story of Strafford's impeachment, imprisonment, attainder, and execution has been told and retold, but never more brilliantly than by Lady Burghclere; by none more touchingly than, in prose and verse, by Robert Browning. Pym's superbly skilful handling of the prosecution; the magnificent courage and resource with which Strafford, though stricken in body and distraught in mind, conducted his defence; the tenuity

of the evidence against the accused ; the persistent malice of his accusers ; the impending breakdown of the impeachment ; the recourse to the deadly weapon of attainder ; the chance thus given to the King to save the life of the servant for whose safety he had solemnly pledged his word ; the pitiable weakness of the unhappy Sovereign ; the selfish terror of the Queen ; the utter defencelessness of the Royal pair in face of the fury of the London mob ; the chivalry with which Strafford, though trusting his Sovereign to the last, released him from his bond ; the black Earl's last hours and his courageous end—are not all these things told in the chronicles of the time ?

Not until our own day has the memory of Strafford been cleared of the aspersions cast upon him by the malignity of contemporaries, and the envenomed criticism of the Whig historians. For the rancour exhibited by the men on whom the hand of the Irish Deputy had fallen heavy ; for Pym and his colleagues, inflamed by the passions of the hour, and convinced perhaps that it was his life or theirs ; for the grim comments of a Scottish Calvinist like Baillie, there is some excuse. But what can be urged in extenuation of the historian, a prey though he was to the fascination of rhetorical antitheses, who could sit down, with ample evidence before him, to review from the standpoint of the nineteenth century this critical episode in the history of the seventeenth ? Between Strafford and Archbishop Ussher there were no special bonds of sympathy, yet Ussher declared, at a moment of special solemnity, that he had never known a whiter soul. By those who know Strafford best that judgment has now been generally endorsed. His faults of temper are plain : he was impatient of opposition, too careless to conciliate, in the conduct of affairs tactless and overbearing ; but, for all that, alike in personal character, in his domestic relations, and in public life, Strafford was pre-eminently a ' white man.'

J. A. R. MARRIOTT.

Art. 12.—THE FORESTRY COMMISSION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

WITH the passing of the Forestry Bill in 1919 and the advent of the Forestry Commissioners the forestry problem, or to give its present correct appellation, the afforestation problem in Great Britain passed into a new phase. At length there appeared on the scene a recognised body of individuals whom Parliament had empowered to introduce a forest policy into the country, and with the powers thus accorded funds were provided. It will be unnecessary to go at length into the history of the predecessors of the Forestry Commissioners. As is commonly known the first of modern attempts to grapple with the forestry problem was made on the appointment of the Development Commissioners in 1910, one of the subjects falling within their scope being Forestry. But the Development Commissioners had no executive powers. Their duties were restricted to giving advice and the recommendation of grants for definite purposes, which were provided by the Treasury. The Commissioners turned their attention to Forest Education, to which they gave considerable assistance. The efforts made to support State afforestation were based on the lines of (1) leasing, (2) a proceeds-sharing system, to which reference will be made later. The War naturally restricted any efforts made to promote new schemes.

The Reconstruction Committee appointed a Sub-Committee to consider the question of Forestry and Afforestation for the country as a whole, owing to the great drain upon existing woods caused by the demand for War supplies. The results of the enquiry by this Sub-Committee were embodied in a report commonly known as the Acland Report, which Report the Minister of Reconstruction and the Cabinet accepted as a basis upon which to frame their Forestry Bill. Without any straining of the facts it may be said that the Government had become alarmed during 1917 and 1918 as to the condition of timber supplies in this country. It was well known in certain circles—though the anxious public were unaware of the true position—that coniferous timber supplies for this country were reaching a dangerously low figure and that a continuance of the War through 1919 would

have seen this country cut out. Hardwood supplies would have lasted appreciably longer. But even they would not have proved inexhaustible—since the total area of the woods of Great Britain was estimated at only 3,000,000 acres. Although no real woodland survey had ever been undertaken, this acreage was not very far above the actual when a census was eventually made. It was this well-known and most anxious position by which we found ourselves confronted as regards timber supplies throughout the latter half of the War which led the Government to accept the Acland Report; and it was the same outlook which led the framers of the Acland Report to base their provisions and recommendations primarily on the War and the question of endeavouring to make a provision of timber in the country to cover a future three years' war. The main timber the Committee had in view was coniferous—in such large demand on the western fronts, though in the middle east hardwoods, largely from Indian forests, had of necessity to be used—to be grown by the afforestation of bare lands in this country.

It was estimated that in order to make provision for a three-year supply an area of 1,770,000 acres would be required, to be planted within a period of eighty years at a total cost of 15,000,000*l*. During the first decade an area of 260,000 acres was to be planted at an estimated cost of 2,872,500*l*. With reference to the land required the Report recommended that 50,000 acres should be purchased and 100,000 leased; 25,000 acres to be dealt with under the proceeds-sharing basis, 25,000 acres to be afforested by local bodies and private owners, whilst 50,000 acres were to be replanted. The rate of planting would depend on circumstances, beginning with 3300 acres in the first year and working up to 30,000 acres in the tenth. The Forestry Bill was passed in 1919. Its clauses were severely simple; but it did not embody the hard and fast suggestions of the Acland Report on the subject of definite areas of land to be planted annually and consequently of definite areas to be annually acquired by Government by purchase or otherwise.

The Forestry Commissioners were appointed for a ten-year period and a total sum of 3,500,000*l*. was sanctioned by Parliament for the decade, the sums

required to be voted in year-to-year instalments against estimates. The work was entrusted to the Commissioners, who were not placed under a Cabinet Minister but had a spokesman in the House of Commons. By this means it was hoped, so the argument ran, to divorce the new forestry work from politics and parties. With the arrival of the Geddes axe, following the second interim Report of the Committee on National Expenditure (1922) the infant Forest Department had a narrow shave of being ended. To Lord Lovat, as much as to any other, its escape was probably due; but the Commissioners were forced to curtail their expenditure, to make reductions in staff, and limit their activities in land acquisition, all of which the writer of the Commissioners' 'Review of the first ten years' work, 1919-29,' says 'in the long run proved the reverse of economical and entailed great inconvenience to the development of the work. The object of the ten-year programme was to avoid uncertainty. Uncertainty is the worst enemy of the Commissioners' work and they have, therefore, noted with satisfaction that successive Chancellors of the Exchequer have come more and more to appreciate that point of view.' As to the appreciation of the Chancellors, this may have been true; but their record since 1924 (when the Commission were allowed to go ahead again with the full programme) is so meagre, as the present state of the country bears witness, that it would appear inadvisable to attach too great faith in the future to those ministers. Nearly every Annual Report of the Commissioners has complained of the interference and restriction of their work through the Geddes axe. And yet it is difficult to see why a comparatively new body such as the Forestry Commissioners should have expected to escape from an act that was intended to deal with every Department of the State. Their attitude is only explainable by the fact that they started their work with the fixed, unalterable idea that it was to be governed by a definite annual planting area and a definite annual acquisition of land. The fact that these objects were interfered with for two years only appeared to harden the opinions of the Commissioners on these two aspects of their work. It must be placed to their credit that in spite of difficulties they very nearly accomplished both.

But many in the country are asking whether the magnificent effort made was not too dearly purchased—whether, in fact, the Bill under which the first ten years of work was accomplished would not have been more appropriately entitled the 'Afforestation Bill.' For afforestation, new afforestation of bare lands, was the chief work carried out during the ten-year period.

Before the Bill was passed, and for many years previously, it had been regarded as certain that when the Forestry business was taken up by the Government it would be to Scotland that the greatest share of the work would fall. This expectation was not fulfilled. Land proved easier of acquisition in England and the planting work went ahead in the south, although towards the end of the period Scotland was able to make up leeway. As was perhaps inevitable, unemployment was a factor in enabling the Commissioners to obtain sanction to undertake the full work under the Forestry Bill, and in 1924 sanction was given to the establishment, not previously contemplated, of forest workers' holdings on a considerable scale. Notwithstanding what has been said above, it will be conceded that the Forestry Commission, in the face of many difficulties and at times ignorant, if apparently well-intentioned, opposition from sections of the public, has carried out very fine work. Their rigid adherence to the Acland plan during the first decade, taking into consideration all the circumstances with which they were faced, may have been the right policy. At all events, should the plantations formed during the period have the hoped-for success, the country will be on the way to retrieving some of the lumbering of existing coniferous plantations for whose disappearance the War was responsible.

The Acland Committee laid down the following areas to be planted during the first decade: (a) With conifers by the State—150,000 acres; (b) with hardwoods by the State—unspecified; (c) by local authorities and private individuals with State aid—110,000. Land was to be acquired by one or other means in sufficient amounts to enable this programme to be achieved. The total area of plantable land acquired to Sept. 30, 1929, was 310,230 acres compared with 402,000 (382,000 for conifers and 20,000 for hardwoods) recommended by the Acland

Committee. The shortage was therefore 91,770 acres, or 22·8 per cent. of the total. The shortage in acquisition is attributed to uncertainty as to finance, though perhaps the difficulties in obtaining suitable land, especially in Scotland, may have accounted for some of the deficiency; for the Report states that the rate of acquisition again fell between 1926 and 1929 when the money difficulty apparently had been overcome. One obstacle was, of course, as the Report of the decade states, 'the difficulty of securing afforestation land only, in distinction to mixed subjects. It has frequently arisen that owners have been willing to sell or lease large blocks of afforestable land only on condition that agricultural land, buildings, and even mansion houses are taken as well.'

The following table gives a summary of the work accomplished as compared with the Acland programme :

Work.	Acland Programme. Acres.	Actuals to Sept. 30, 1929. Acres.
<i>Acquisition of plantable land.</i>		
For planting conifers	382,000	310,230
Devastated hardwood areas ...	20,000	
	402,000	
<i>State planting.</i>		
Conifers	150,000	130,768
Hardwoods	Unspecified	7,511
		138,279
<i>State-aided planting</i>	110,000	76,736
<i>Forest Workers' Holdings</i> ...	Nil	618 completed 245 in progress

The average price paid for plantable land was 3*l.* 5*s.* 9*d.* per acre, which, 'having regard to the use to which such land is put, the Commissioners believe to be fair both to the vendors and to the State. There are undoubtedly in Great Britain very large areas of uncultivated land which, when stripped of their buildings, are of no greater worth than the average price paid hitherto and are yet well suited for growing timber.' Under the heading 'The Commissioners' Estates' (perhaps better denominated 'The Estates of the State' or 'Public Estates') the review of the decade states :

'At Sept. 30, 1929, the Commissioners had under their charge 602,000 acres of land, of which 251,000 acres had been

acquired by purchase, 231,000 acres by long lease or feu, and the balance, approximately 120,000 acres, had been transferred to them from the Commissioners of Crown Lands under the Transfer of Woods Act, 1923. In acquiring land the Commissioners have kept constantly in view their main functions which are to establish forests and forest workers' holdings. The acquisition of assets surplus to those requirements has been avoided so far as possible and where it has been necessary to acquire surplus assets in order to build up desirable forest properties the policy is to dispose of them as rapidly as sound business permits.'

The Commissioners set out to plant 150,000 acres of conifers in the decade. The shortage in the planting programme amounted to 19,232 acres or 12·8 per cent. The Acland programme, they write :

'was an expanding one beginning with nil in the first year and growing at the rate of 3300 acres per annum to 30,000 acres in the tenth year. An excellent start was made, and by 1922 the rate of planting was well in advance of the prescribed rate. For reasons of finance the planting rate was then stabilised at nearly 10,000 acres per annum for three years. From 1924 to 1927 more money was available and the expanding programme was resumed. From 1927 to 1929, the rate of planting fell away slightly, again owing to difficulties of finance which had curtailed land acquisition.'

Of hardwoods they only managed to plant a total area of 7511 acres. The inadequacy of this very small effort was the subject of considerable criticism by many interested in the future supplies of some of the magnificent hardwoods of Great Britain. It is thus explained in the review :

'In criticisms of the Commissioners' planting policy attention has been drawn to the great preponderance in area of coniferous over broadleaved plantations. A memorandum on the subject was accordingly issued in December 1929, and has since been published in the technical press. Briefly, in the economics of timber production the scales are heavily weighted against broadleaved species as compared with conifers. In a sense this is fortunate since the overwhelming demand is for softwood timber, but it is necessary nevertheless to maintain a home supply of hardwoods. While, therefore, the Commissioners consider that the most important problem immediately before them is to provide a supply of

softwoods, in replacement of the woods so heavily depleted during the War, they are not neglecting opportunities of acquiring suitable hardwood soils and concurrently they are attempting to improve methods of raising hardwood crops.'

This reply scarcely answers many of the criticisms which have been advanced upon this subject. It ignores one of the chief. According to the excellent Census of British Woodlands undertaken by the Commissioners there were 808,800 acres of felled woods and scrub which were designated, from the forestry point of view, as 'idle land.' And yet this land at least possesses one part of the capital in forestry, a forest soil, which the bare lands upon which afforestation work was concentrated do not possess. And during the ten years and more which have elapsed on the areas felled during the War, this forest soil has depreciated in value from exposure and become covered with a weed growth which will be expensive to remove when reafforestation work is eventually applied to them. Some small portion of this enormous area may have been dealt with under assisted planting schemes, but the review does not differentiate under this head between afforestation work on new land and replanting. Under Assistance to Local Authorities and Private Owners the following information given in the review enables an appreciation to be made in the progress in this direction :

'The area proposed by the Acland Committee to be afforested or replanted by local authorities and private owners with State assistance during the decade was 110,000 acres. The actual area planted amounted to 76,736 acres, but this area will be further increased to a small extent when current programmes have been completed. Two methods of encouraging planting have been adopted. The first of these was the proceeds-sharing scheme initiated by the Development Commissioners in respect of two undertakings. One of the schemes has since dropped out but the other (with Liverpool Corporation in respect of their Lake Vyrnwy catchment area) has proceeded satisfactorily. The total area afforested under proceeds-sharing schemes amounted to 2373 acres. This method of procedure, while superficially attractive, has failed to appeal to owners of woodland and afforestable land, and little progress is likely on similar lines. The second method of encouragement on which the Commissioners have

mainly relied is that of direct grants on an acreage basis. Owing to the restrictive conditions imposed on State-aid by the Forestry Act, 1919, no progress was made during the planting seasons 1919-20 and 1920-21. These conditions were suspended in respect of grants placed at the disposal of the Commissioners for the relief of unemployment and a beginning was made on a large scale in 1921-22. The restrictive conditions were entirely repealed by the Forestry (Transfer of Woods) Act, 1923, and thereafter considerable progress was made.'

The totals were as follows: Planted, 53,792 acres; prepared for planting, 20,571 acres; cleared of scrub, 9743 acres. The total area of forest at the end of the decade amounted to 202,744 acres, of which 138,279 were planted and replanted by the Commissioners, 7783 were acquired by purchase, and 64,554 (Forest of Dean, New Forest, and remnants of other old Royal Forests, High Meadow, Tintern, etc.) were transferred under the 1923 Act. In addition to the area already under forest and plantations there were 164,168 acres of plantable land awaiting afforestation. The total area of forest and potential forest was, therefore, 366,912 acres. There were 152 forest units; 65 units in England, 22 in Wales and Monmouth, and 65 in Scotland. Of these 15 are transferred subjects (12 in England, 2 in Wales and Monmouth, and 1 in Scotland—Inverliever—acquired by the Office of Woods). The remainder were acquired by the Commissioners and form the nuclei of the new State forests. The units naturally differ in size, locality factors, and so forth. The largest are: in England, Thetford Chase (24,307 acres), New Forest (22,410), and Allerston (9715); in Wales, Vaughan (9079 acres) and Clocaenog (8475); and in Scotland, Clashindarroch (7978 acres). The areas are those of planted and plantable land in each. The areas of the units are not necessarily their possible ultimate size. As intervening land becomes available units will be amalgamated. As might be expected, the land acquired varies in character, and it is the poorer type which has proved the easier to obtain. Excellent work has been undertaken on such poor types as, *e.g.*, the sand dunes at Culbin and Pembrey, and on sandy heaths as represented in East Anglia (Thetford and Rendlesham), Dorset (Wareham), Stafford

(Cannock Chase), Nottingham (Clipstone), and Fife (Tentsmuir). Scots and Corsican Pine are the chief species used on this type. The review states that considerable areas of devastated woodland and unproductive coppice (amounting to 76,200 acres) have been acquired in England, Wales, and Scotland.

The respective areas of hardwood and conifers are not given, but the significant remark is made, 'As a rule such areas are very good for timber growth but are expensive to afforest if they have been allowed to lie derelict.' In other words, the rate of progress of the coniferous afforestation programme would have been interfered with if the Commissioners had devoted their energies to reafforesting by one means or the other a larger part of these areas possessing a forest soil. In the future they will become even more expensive to deal with, owing to the lengthening period over which they are allowed 'to lie derelict.' It is interesting to note, in view of the old-time campaign to plant up the deer forests in Scotland, that the consensus of expert opinion now-a-days appears to be that 'it is only under exceptionally favourable circumstances that deer forests form good subjects for afforestation.' It is too early to form definite opinions on the new plantations, but the review states that some have formed or are forming thicket stage, Douglas and the larches of the earliest formed plantations leading the way, whilst a great deal of planting experience has been attained.

Space will not admit a consideration of the more technical part of the review dealing with Education and research and experimental work. Nor are opinions unanimous throughout the country as to the value or wisdom of some of the Commissioners interventions in these respects. But for the general public a discussion of these matters would prove of little interest.

Lord Lovat was Chairman of the Commission from the commencement till March 3, 1927. Lord Clinton succeeded, and on his resignation at the end of the tenth year, the present Chairman, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, was appointed, Mr R. L. Robinson acted as technical Commissioner throughout the period.

The review of the first decade's work embodies a

brief notice of the proposals for the second period of work. This programme foreshadows a clinging to the Acland Committee's proposals drawn up fifteen years ago in the middle of a strenuous War. It is to be hoped that the Commissioners, now that they have had ample time to shake down into harness, will see the wisdom of not fettering their activities and the undeniable possibilities for doing good on the countryside by adhering to so rigid a policy, if policy it can be termed, as that laid down in this ancient scheme.

The late Government agreed to the general lines of a Forest Policy which was drawn up by the Commissioners, the final objectives being the addition of 1,770,000 acres of forest in 80 years to the 3,000,000 supposedly existing in 1919 which, said the Scheme, were to be maintained. The proposed planting programme for the second decade was to lie

' between a minimum of 330,000 acres and a maximum of 550,000 acres. The minimum area would make a just contribution towards the eighty-year programme while the maximum was necessary if the devastated woodland areas and the woodlands classed as non-productive in the Census were to be made good within half a century. They felt also that serious attention should be given to ensuring that felled areas, scrub, and coppice were planted either by the owners, if necessary with the aid of grants, or by the State after exercise, if necessary, of powers of compulsory acquisition.'

Compulsory acquisition is a dangerous method for a Forest Department to advocate. Successful forest administration, especially where it has for its object the creation of large areas of coniferous forests, will have to rely on the exercise of tact in the highest form and to the greatest degree if the forests are not to be unnecessarily imperilled at the hands of the retaliator with an imaginary or what he believes to be a justifiable grievance. This problem should be capable, and we feel confident is capable, of solution once the Commissioners have made up their minds to devote time and money to the matter. No forester could contemplate with equanimity some of the war devastated areas awaiting replanting for nearly half a century!

The late Government in considering the requirements

for the second decade voted a sum of 5,500,000*l.* to the forestry fund in agreed annual instalments. In addition, the Commissioners would enjoy an increased revenue from forest products of 1,400,000*l.* These sums, it was estimated, would enable 225,000 acres of new plantations to be formed, whilst 1,000,000*l.* was to be devoted to forest workers' holdings. The Government said that the increased provision was the utmost which the Exchequer could provide. With a new Government and its Inter-departmental Committee on Unemployment a chance arrived of obtaining a further grant and the 5,500,000*l.* was increased to 9,000,000*l.*, the afforestation programme to be raised to 330,000 acres for the decade, whilst 3000 forest workers' holdings were to be created. It may be noted that these latter, though inevitably in many cases expensive, must be regarded as of great value on the countryside whilst being a necessity in a big forestry scheme. Of the above sum the estimated cost for forestry operations is slightly over 8,000,000*l.* Provision is made for the acquisition of plantable land at a uniform rate of 60,000 acres per annum. In addition to 330,000 of new afforestation 23,000 acres of replacements, that is of replanting existing plantations, is to be carried out. About 150,000*l.* is allowed for advances for afforestation purposes ; 100,000*l.* for education ; 100,000*l.* for research, and 20,000*l.* for Special Services.

A last section of this forecast is devoted to Private Forestry. The Commissioners regard the existing position in this respect as thoroughly unsatisfactory—as well they may. But a careful review of their work during the past eleven years, good as in many respects that work has been, has failed to show that they have made or at least announced any broad administrative views and suggestions for dealing with the question. Every one is aware of the burdens of taxation, death duties, and so forth. It is the solution of an urgent forestry problem which the public look to the Commissioners to provide—with an assurance that the future hardwood supplies of Great Britain will not be ignored during the present decade.

E. P. STEBBING.

✓ Art. 13.—MAHATMA GANDHI : A STUDY IN DESTRUCTIVENESS.

1. *Mahatma Gandhi : His own Story.* Edited by C. F. Andrews. Allen and Unwin.
2. *Lenin and Gandhi.* By Rene Fülöp-Miller. Translated from the German by F. S. Flint and D. F. Tait. Putnam's, 1930.

MR GANDHI'S autobiography, of which the volume edited by Mr Andrews is an abridged form, will make its chief appeal to Western readers who genuinely desire enlightenment about India and Gandhism, but know little or nothing about either beyond what the papers tell them. It will stimulate interest in Gandhi, the man, which has dwindled sensibly of late. Gandhism, as expressed in the movements of civil disobedience, non-co-operation, hartals, and general Anglophobia, passive and active, initiated by Mr Gandhi, is by no means dead ; indeed, it is likely that under various forms it has come to stay ; but the vogue of Gandhi, the Man, the Leader, the Mahatma, is passing. His death will revive it, and the attempt will then be made to transform him into a cult.

Mr Gandhi's disciples speak of him always as the Mahatma. What exactly is a Mahatma ? In 'A Short List of Common Indian Words,' and under the heading of 'Titles of Reverence and Respect,' we find 'Mahatma' explained as 'A title of Gandhi's, meaning "Great Soul."' 'What this word "Mahatma," "great soul," means to the Hindu is also explained to us by Rabindranath Tagore : "The word 'Mahatma' means the liberated ego which rediscovers itself in all other souls, that life no longer confined in individual human beings, the comprehensive soul of the Atman, of the spirit. In this way the soul becomes 'Mahatma' by comprehending all souls, all spirit in itself.'"* Mr Gandhi has been singularly fortunate in the literature concerning himself, his Ideas, his Message, and his Works, which has grown up around him and is supplementary to, or arising out of, his own autobiographical 'Experiments with Truth.' Almost without exception this literature is laudatory, often fulsomely so, in character, criticism being confined to the press and to

* Fülöp-Miller, p. 162.

individuals who are always described as 'prejudiced' by the Ghandists. It is an interesting and suggestive fact that all Mr Gandhi's eulogists evince a distinctly anti-British bias in their views and appear to find him a good stick with which to belabour England. Those who take the trouble to study this literature will presently realise the truth of my statement. A comprehensive list of books is given here, beginning with M. Romain Rolland's book (which the Editor considers the best of them all), but omitting Herr Fülöp-Miller's 'Lenin and Gandhi,' a work of real force and suggestiveness. Mr Gandhi's autobiography, as we have it here, has singular interest. Three facts stand out in it with startling clearness; namely, the innate contumacy of Mr Gandhi, the depth of his colour prejudice, amounting at times to an obsession where English rule is concerned, and the surprising truth that the main opposition to his theories and actions has come from his own people in India and the South Africans, though his antipathy to England causes him to lay the responsibility at her door. Mr Gandhi is first and last a rebel. He describes himself as having been a 'dutiful and obedient child,' but his first act of rebellion was against his parents and his religion when, as a small boy, he ate meat at the bidding of a false friend, who had persuaded him that the Hindus were weak because they did not eat meat and that the secret of British domination lay in their carnivorous habits. Even a course of nightmares and indigestion failed to cure the youthful offender, who next took to robbing the servant in order to buy cigarettes, and then, being caught in the toils of nausea and remorse, he decided to commit suicide. For this extreme step, however, he and his false friend happily lacked the courage; instead, young Gandhi wrote out a full confession of his sins and handed it to his father, whose silent forgiveness impressed him more than any blows or lectures could have done.

Mr Gandhi has tolerance for most creeds but none for Christianity, owing to his having overheard as a child certain charges made against Christian missionaries and their Indian converts which unhappily got on his nerves and made him dislike it. But he tried experiments in practice of returning good for evil and discovered that slaughter of snakes and bugs was a moral occupation,

while Truth grew daily in magnitude within him and, we understand, is still growing. At the age of eighteen he wrung permission from his mother (his father being dead) to study law in England, and sailed from Bombay full of hope and enthusiasm. He travelled in a black suit but landed in white flannels, somewhat to the annoyance of an Indian friend who had come to meet him in a top-hat. His first experience on English soil was unfortunate; he spoiled the friend's top-hat by rubbing it the wrong way. In England he learned to dress like the natives, read Sir Edwin Arnold and Carlyle, met Madame Blavatsky and Mrs Besant, called on Cardinal Manning, and attended Mr Bradlaugh's funeral. But he also studied hard and, mindful of the sacrifices made by his family to enable him to come to England, he trained himself to live on 1s. 3d. a day. At the end of three years he passed his examinations well and was free to return to India. A most unfortunate incident, which occurred soon after his return, seems to have laid the foundation of an enduring enmity towards the British Raj. His brother, formerly secretary to the late Rana of Porbandar, having fallen under an accusation, compelled Mr Gandhi to beg for him the good offices of the Political Agent, with whom he (Gandhi) had been on fairly friendly terms in England. Mr Gandhi obtained an interview, but the English official seemed to him now to be another person and to resent any claim upon their former acquaintance; somewhat curtly he told Mr Gandhi that his brother was an intriguer, and refused to re-open the matter. When Mr Gandhi continued to plead his brother's cause the Political Agent requested him to leave, and, as Gandhi went on explaining, a servant was called who put him out of the room, though without violence. Altogether a sorry affair. Mr Gandhi, his anger at white heat, wrote the Political Agent a letter accusing him of insult and assault and threatening him with legal proceedings; to which a cold but civil reply was immediately returned. Mr Gandhi had been 'rude' in refusing to leave when asked to do so, he was at liberty to proceed against the Englishman if he wished. The shock changed the whole course of Mr Gandhi's life. We can understand this, and can cap the tale with one from personal knowledge, in which another Eastern gentleman being roughly jostled by mistake by a British soldier

during a small street row, changed on the spot from a life-long lover of England into a violent Anglophobe, and took at least eighteen months to get through this phase. On such frail threads of temperament—or temper—men's destinies can swing. Mr Gandhi went from shock to shock, for the Indian Administrator with whom he next had dealings proved to be even more overbearing than the Englishman.

Mr Gandhi now received an offer to go out to South Africa to assist an Indian firm in a lawsuit involving a claim of 40,000*l*. This time he landed in a frock coat and a small turban, but was again unfortunate, as the turban presently became the subject of a small controversy in the Courts. Every English reader must deplore the rank discourtesy and frequent injustice of Mr Gandhi's treatment in South Africa, on the score of his Indian nationality; everything combined to aggravate his sore feelings and his anti-British complex, though the worst offenders were often the Boers. His fight to improve the conditions of Indian life and labour prevailing in South Africa before the Boer War of 1899, brought him much attention, whether friendly or otherwise; and this is the most interesting part of his story as well as the most effective, because most disinterested, in his career. Here he was urged to service rather than to self-expression, and undoubtedly he was able to do much for his fellow countrymen in a land where the conditions of life and work were made very bitter. During these years he studied various creeds, a pursuit which encouraged the habit of introspection, always present in thoughtful Easterns in an intense form. Returning to India in 1896, Mr Gandhi conducted a successful campaign upon the Indian Case in South Africa, writing pamphlets and press articles and addressing meetings on the subject he had so much at heart. His labours were interrupted by a cabled summons to return to Natal, and he sailed without delay, this time taking his family with him. A body of 800 Indian emigrants sailed at the same time, in his ship and another. South Africans had been thoroughly incensed by Reuter's cabled summaries of Mr Gandhi's speeches on the Indian question; these summaries Mr Gandhi considered to have been 'distorted' through being so much curtailed. Public excitement increased when it became known that 800

Indian would-be settlers were accompanying him, and a committee of indignation was formed, the members declaring themselves ready to prevent the immigrants' landing by force if necessary. Faced with a most uncomfortable and even dangerous situation—for Indian feeling was no less incensed—the Natal Government sought refuge in compromise, always a shabby coat for a Government to wear. The ships were put under quarantine, on the excuse of there being danger of the Indians bringing in bubonic plague. On landing at last (January 1897), Mr Gandhi was mobbed and roughly handled, and he owed his preservation from more serious harm to the courage of an Englishwoman, the wife of the Superintendent of Police, who walked beside him sheltering him with her parasol until a police patrol arrived. The superintendent smuggled him out of the police station disguised as an Indian constable, himself engaging the angry crowd until Mr Gandhi had made good his escape. His enemies had gone too far; public opinion veered round in his favour, and Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, instructed the Natal Government to prosecute his assailants and to see that he had justice.

Mr Gandhi was still in South Africa when the Boer War broke out, nearly three years later. The Indian Community were sharply divided as to the course they should follow; both Boers and British, they said, had oppressed them, and why should they help the British to defeat the Boers, especially as if the Boers won the Indians would certainly suffer for having helped the other side. Mr Gandhi, however, saw further. The Indians, he said, had no status at all in South Africa save as British subjects, and they had always insisted upon their citizenship; the rights or wrongs of the war were no concern of theirs, but by supporting the British now they would probably better their conditions everywhere. He raised and accompanied an Indian Ambulance Corps of nearly 1100 men which went to the front and did excellent service, being mentioned in despatches by General Buller, while thirty-seven of the leaders were decorated. Mr Gandhi returned the Boer War medals and the Kaiser-i-Hind medal in gold, given for humanitarian services in South Africa (1906), to the Viceroy in 1928. By this time Mr Gandhi had built up a steady legal practice and was also earning

considerable attention, favourable and otherwise, through his writings in 'Indian Opinion,' the organ of his movement and the medium of his views. His prompt and plucky behaviour during an outbreak of plague in the Indian Quarter brought him much praise and increased his practice. After reading Ruskin's 'Unto this Last' (rendered throughout this book as 'Until this Last'), he discovered that tilling the soil was the life worth living, and he therefore decided to remove 'Indian Opinion' to a country farm, on which all his immediate circle should work and support themselves while they ran the paper in their spare time. This was the start (1904) of the Phoenix Settlement; the land, in all some 1000 acres, was shared out amongst the members in three-acre plots. A moral lapse on the part of two of the inmates of the Ashram at Phoenix led to Mr Gandhi imposing on himself for the first time the vicarious penance of a seven-days' fast, followed by a period of four and a half months during which he took only one meal a day.

The account of Satyagraha (literally, the power of truth, in Mr Gandhi's interpretation active resistance as opposed to passive) in Natal, which was initiated by him in 1913, deserves attention. We are here concerned less with the admitted injustice * which gave Mr Gandhi his 'welcome' opportunity of open warfare with the South African Government than with the method of its conduct. Eleven women from Tolstoy Farm (a sister settlement to Phoenix) were invited to share in the struggle by going to prison with the men; their offence was to be that of hawking goods without being duly licensed thereto. As the police declined to arrest these ladies, Mr Gandhi decided that he must offer up all the adult population of Phoenix, except the few who were necessary to run 'Indian Opinion.' The method he adopted was simple. It was an offence to enter the Transvaal or Natal from

* By the ruling of Mr Justice Searle in the Cape Supreme Court (March 14, 1913) no marriages were legal save those celebrated after Christian rites and registered by the Registrar of Marriages. This ruling automatically illegalised all non-Christian marriages and made the children of such marriages illegitimate, with a consequent appalling tangle of questions of inheritance. But, 'In 1913 . . . the validity of Indian marriages was recognised. The South African Government by a special law granted the immigrants complete freedom and equality of rights.' (Fülop-Miller, p. 287.)

either State without a permit ; Mr Gandhi despatched his stalwarts to the great coal mines at Newcastle, Natal, without authority other than his own instructions to get the Indian labourers out on strike. After hearing of their success, Mr Gandhi arranged to follow them to Newcastle, to lead the strikers thence to the Transvaal, and to see them safely into jail there. On Oct. 28, 1913, the strikers set out on a two days' march ; they received much kindness and help on the way, and Mr Gandhi (who had undertaken to head the cooks) still retains the happiest memories of the Sanitary Department at Charleston. At Volksrust he was arrested and taken to the jail at Bloemfontein, where he lived on a diet of bananas, tomatoes, nuts, limes, and olive oil, which must have been a not unpleasant change from his recent culinary struggles. The situation of the strikers, however, went from bad to worse, and Lord Hardinge, then Viceroy of India, openly blamed the South African Government for its mishandling of the affair. Eventually a provisional agreement was reached, and in July 1914 Mr Gandhi and his entourage sailed for England, arriving two days after the outbreak of the Great War. His offer of the services of Indians in London as an ambulance corps was accepted by Lord Crewe on behalf of the Government after some delay ; but owing to severe illness Mr Gandhi himself had to return to India in December 1914. Soon after his arrival Mr Gandhi went to see Lord Willingdon, Governor of Bombay, who invited him to come and see him whenever he designed taking steps affecting the Government, and on receiving Mr Gandhi's promise to do so, thanked him courteously, told him to come whenever he liked, and assured him that he would never find the Government deliberately dealing wrongly with the Indian people.

In March 1916 Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviyaji moved a resolution in the Imperial Legislative Council recommending the abolition of the hated system of indentured labour, to which Lord Hardinge replied that His Majesty's Government had promised its abolition 'in due course.' In February 1917 Pandit Malaviyaji desired to introduce a Bill for its immediate abolition, but was refused permission by Lord Chelmsford, then Viceroy. Mr Gandhi decided that the moment was ripe

for him to stump the country for an All-India protest. He opened his campaign in Bombay after an interview with the Viceroy, 'who (Mr Gandhi says) without being definite promised to be helpful.' We quote the actual words in the book as we confess ourselves unable to understand them, and therefore will not risk a possible misinterpretation of them by paraphrase. We should have liked a full account of this important interview, for the words quoted tell us nothing, and it is difficult to understand how the Viceroy could pledge himself to be 'helpful' to an agitator about to raise the country in an attempt to force the hand of the Government. A deputation of ladies also waited upon the Viceroy and reported that they had received 'an encouraging reply.' Three proposals were discussed by the Indian leaders: (1) abolition by May 31; (2) abolition as soon as possible; (3) immediate abolition. Mr Gandhi preferred the first plan, which accordingly was decided upon. He continued to travel and to agitate, but before May 31 dawned the Government announced that indentured emigration from India was at an end. Mr Gandhi, however, went on travelling and agitating, with a restful interlude during which he did his best to educate the Biharis in good manners and in the laws of sanitation, and also treated them medically, when necessary, with castor oil, quinine, and sulphur ointment, castor oil being easily the favourite. Sanitation was less popular. The Biharis did not really enjoy having their villages cleaned up and made hygienic by kind-hearted volunteers, though eventually some of them became so keen on good works that they took to making nice smooth roads for Mr Gandhi's car to travel over. Later on, at Mr Gandhi's suggestion, Sir Edward Gart, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bihar, appointed a Commission to inquire into the wrongs and grievances of the *Bihari raiyats* (peasants), and invited Mr Gandhi to serve on it. Mr Gandhi notes that it was largely due to His Excellency's efforts that the Commission brought in an unanimous report in favour of the *raiya*s, and that he had much to do also with the subsequent passage of the Agrarian Bill.

The Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, invited Mr Gandhi and other Indian leaders to join in a conference on recruiting during the height of the War. Mr Gandhi had various

objections to attending, the chief one being that the Ali Brothers (Moslems) could not be present as they were in prison. Being anxious to enlist Moslem sympathy in his own movement, he told the Moslems that it was their duty to secure the brothers' release, wrote to the Government on the subject, and also made a study of the Khilafat Question (i.e. the succession to the Khalifate), which, by the way, was a Turkish question, advanced by Turkey in the War for purely political reasons. Being asked how he, the advocate of non-violence and passive resistance, could support Islam, the warlike creed of a warlike people, Mr Gandhi replied :

'My association with the noblest Mussulmans has taught me to see that Islam has spread not by the power of the sword but by the prayerful love of an unbroken line of its saints and fakirs. Warrant there is in Islam for drawing the sword ; but the conditions laid down are so strict that they are not capable of being fulfilled by everybody. Where is the unerring general to order a Jihad ? Where is the suffering, the love, and purification that must precede the very idea of drawing the sword ?' *

The hair-splitting legal mind is apparent here.† When Mr Gandhi arrived at Delhi for the Viceroy's Conference an English member of his movement informed him of a recent controversy in the British press upon some alleged secret treaties 'of a predatory character' which had been concluded between Great Britain and Italy, and asked him if, in view of this, he could conscientiously attend the Conference ? Mr Gandhi, without going any further into the subject, promptly wrote to the Viceroy to say that he could not attend the Conference, and why. Lord Chelmsford behaved with the patience and courtesy which Mr Gandhi has received from every Viceroy, without exception. He invited Mr Gandhi to come and talk the matter over with him and his private secretary, and when the Indian, in the course of a long interview, learned that neither of the Englishmen knew anything of the alleged 'predatory' treaties, and were not inclined to accept them on the sole evidence of a press controversy, Mr

* Fülöp-Miller, pp. 278-279.

† Mr Gandhi took the chair at the great Moslem Khilafat Conference (Nov. 24, 1919), supported Moslem demands, and promised that Hindus would make the Moslem cause their own. (Fülöp-Miller, p. 275.)

Gandhi agreed to take part in the Conference after all. The incident is of no importance, but we give it in detail as an illustration of the courtesy, forbearance, and patience shown by every Viceroy in succession in his dealings with this impulsive, officious, but often well-meaning little man.

The Conference aimed at the consolidation of unity throughout India, in face of the grave danger of the War. Mr Gandhi supported the Resolution on Recruiting, speaking both in Hindustani and English. After the meeting he received many congratulations on having been the first to speak in Hindustani at a meeting of this sort, and his nationalism was deeply offended at what he took to be a fresh proof of the abasement of Indians by the British. It did not occur either to him or to his admirers that on such occasions English was the only possible *general* medium of speech between the many parties participating; the Viceroys hold office for five years, and have no time to learn Hindustani, whereas educated Indians of all sections and Provinces speak English well. His own difficulties in communicating with the Biharis might have given him understanding here, and saved his patriotism from being hurt; and indeed, a very little reflection would have shown him that to speak English at the Viceroy's conference-table involved no slight to Indians but rather implied a compliment upon their superior linguistic attainments. This incident, too, throws light upon Mr Gandhi's outlook and the readiness of even the most earnest and highly educated Easterns to take offence at Western ways. Laying aside his injured feelings, however, Mr Gandhi set off on a recruiting campaign, writing and distributing leaflets inciting the men to join up for war service of all sorts. As an inducement to enlist he reminded Indians that 'the blackest of all the British misdeeds' in India was the Arms Act, and that the best way to obtain its repeal was to help the Government voluntarily now in their difficulties, so that British distrust of Indians would be dispelled and the use of arms be allowed in consequence. To his grief, Mr Gandhi found that this unique argument in favour of recruiting was unacceptable to the Commissioner of Gujerat, in whose Province it was used. Mr Gandhi, by the way, is a Gujerati by birth and descent.

A severe attack of illness, induced by an unfortunate mistake in diet, followed on these efforts, and before Mr Gandhi was well enough to continue them Germany had been defeated and the need had passed. During his convalescence he was advised to take goat's milk for nourishment as his strength was greatly diminished, and, in his eagerness to regain his health in order to resume the Satyagraha fight, 'the votary of Truth' allowed himself to be persuaded. He became a drinker of milk. Now, by a vow he had bound himself to abstain from drinking milk, and though only cow's and buffalo's milk had been in his mind at the time, all milk was implied in the oath. Though remorse curdles the milk that nourishes him, Mr Gandhi finds himself unable to renounce it, for undoubtedly it strengthens him and enables him to carry on the fight, which he cannot do, of course, if he should unhappily expire of weakness and malnutrition.

Pondering on the best way in which to fight the Rowlatt Act,* Mr Gandhi discovered it through a dream. He must call a hartal for April 6, 1919. He would also prepare for a campaign of civil disobedience by the masses, a campaign best carried out by the distillation of salt from sea-water in their homes and by the sale of proscribed literature. The latter part of the scheme provided a medium for the sale of two of Mr Gandhi's own books; but the Government refused to proceed as expected, and ruled instead that to sell the reprint of a proscribed book was not an offence—this, too, after people had been paying from Rs. 5 to Rs. 50 for a single copy in the hope of being arrested for it. Mr Gandhi decided to go to the Punjab, but was forbidden to do so on the score of his presence being likely to cause trouble. He replied that he did not go to cause trouble but to allay it, and armed with this bland argument he started. He was removed from the train at Palwi and sent back to Bombay, but was courteously treated throughout. His arrival at Bombay was the signal for the gathering of large and excited crowds, and unhappily many people were hurt when the mounted police were ordered to charge and disperse them. Mr Gandhi protested to the Commissioner

* The Rowlatt Act, 1919, dealt severely with sedition. Mr Gandhi objected to it very much.

of Police against this order. The Commissioner replied that he was the best judge of the necessity for such action as he had ordered, and that while Mr Gandhi's intentions were doubtless good, he (Mr Gandhi) could not control the people. Mr Gandhi thought he could; but when he suggested to the people that they should observe a penitential fast for one day only while he fasted for three, they refused point-blank. The Commissioner of Police had judged the man and the situation correctly. The story reminds us of the outrage at Chauri-Chauri (in February 1922), when Mr Gandhi's followers, raised for a civil disobedience campaign, again got out of hand, massacred the police and burnt them in their station—an incident to which no reference is made in this book. A few weeks later (in October) Mr Gandhi was allowed to go to the Punjab. A little patience on his part might have saved a number of the people he loves from getting out of hand on his account, and so from being hurt. In 1920 Mr Gandhi broke with the Government and started his non-co-operation movement. 'Non-co-operation,' he explained, 'is a movement intended to invite the English to co-operate with us on honourable terms or retire from our land.'* The book closes with an account of the Khadi (spinning) movement, in which, as in other cases, Mr Gandhi does the thinking and the disciples do the work. Mr Gandhi himself had not seen a spinning-wheel until the year 1918, but it was a case of love at first sight, and he decided immediately that here was the 'panacea' for Indian poverty. The final words of this remarkable book are a request to the reader to join Mr Gandhi in prayer for himself—not for India.

We lay it aside with feelings of melancholy akin to despair. It is a work of particular interest and value in its frank self-revelation and analysis, in the picture it gives of a man who is both shrewd and short-sighted, full of kindly impulses yet capable of blank indifference to the consequences which a policy or an action of his may involve for others, of an egotism so complete as to render him shock-proof to the world. His habit of gentle platitudinising is typically Eastern and should offend nobody; indeed, it may very well enhance his attractiveness for Westerns who are proverbially over-shy of expressing

* Fülöp-Miller, p. 283.

their own ideals and motives ; but as a habit it leads nowhere. As we write these words we hear of Mr Gandhi's release from prison (Jan. 26, 1931), after some eight or nine months' detention, the immediate demand that the Government shall set free also all Congress prisoners unconditionally, coupled with the order to his own followers to continue the use of his favourite weapons of civil disobedience and non-co-operation. In other words, the Government is to disarm completely at Mr Gandhi's bidding, while he himself sharpens his sword for continued warfare against it. Meanwhile, he will 'reflect,' he tells us, upon the action he will take in regard to the All India Conference ; and thus, after eight months' rest and thought, the votary of Truth again makes manifest that innate contumacy to which we have drawn attention above. England can forgive Mr Gandhi much—has already forgiven him many things—but how much longer can she treat with a man whose whole impetus is towards opposition and destruction ?

Mr Gandhi's day is passing ; the fatigues and failures of age creep over him. What has he done for his people, for India ? He has taught his people the meaning of civil disobedience, the use of the hartal. He has bidden them eschew English education and English medicine, forgetting that he himself is a debtor to both. He has cried in their ears the old Mutiny slogan that 300,000,000 Indians need not be afraid of 100,000 Englishmen—(for how many of those 300,000,000 Indians is Mr Gandhi entitled to speak ?). He has striven to restore the primitive supremacy of the spinning-wheel, and has lit many bonfires with much excellent cloth from Lancashire. He has written various books and pamphlets, and has translated others. He has eaten England's salt, and turned his back upon her. Where then does *India* stand now, as a result of thirty years' agitation ? Is she a step higher in honour, in civilisation, therefor ? Has she added a paragraph or a page to the great story of her Art, fresh inspiration to her Literature ? We picture to ourselves an India 'freed' from the British oppressor, ready to be ruled henceforward after Mr Gandhi's ideals. The British have left thousands of miles of roads and a great railway system to be kept going, mighty bridges to be preserved for human safety, canals and water-ways also ; social

and welfare work, hospitals, maternity, and medical services, to be kept up to date, even if not advanced with the progress of science; laws of sanitation and public hygiene to be observed. Can Mr Gandhi offer any guarantee for the preservation, at least, of these fundamental services without which life under modern conditions cannot exist? Far from it. Mr. Gandhi 'regards hospitals as institutions of the devil and the taking of medicine as the greatest sin a man can commit.' 'Hospitals,' says Mr Gandhi, 'are institutions for the propagation of sin; they seduce men into paying less attention to the warnings of their bodies and giving themselves up more and more to a life of vice.'* Therefore, medical services must go *en bloc*. And railways, hospitals, lawyers—the profession of magistrate is immoral—and telegraphs must all be pitched overboard as well. Nothing is said about newspapers, however. In this way India will be cleansed from all traces of British rule, and the twin problems of over-population and poverty will be solved as well by the unchecked agencies of cholera, plague, and rabies. There is no other answer to our questions, because Mr Gandhi's whole purpose is directed towards Destruction—destruction of the British Raj, destruction of machinery in all forms, of Government, of political and social order generally, of an educational system to which he owes his whole power of expression. And Destruction is simply the negation of life, of progress, and of God, Who is the Creator. No work of man can succeed, can be permanent, which is based upon a principle of destruction, for Destruction is death. We do not attempt to guess what will be the verdict of history upon Mr Gandhi's purpose and achievement. We can go no further, within the narrow limits open to contemporary judgment, than to point out that the All India Conference recently concluded, whose sole concern has been with the needs and the future and the aggrandisement of India, is the outcome not of Mr Gandhi's ideals or Mr Gandhi's actions, but of the vision of the Englishman for India, the Englishman's love for India, and the Englishman's will to serve India.

E. M. E. BLYTH.

* Fülöp-Miller, pp. 238-239.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

An Elizabethan Journal—The Early Russells—‘Account Rendered’—London Government—The Emperor Karl—French and Chilean Histories—Nansen—A Mecca Pilgrimage—Mr Shan Bullock—The Suffragettes—The Barrier Reef—‘Anglic’—The Greek Mind—‘R. L. S.,’ Blake, and Christina Rossetti—The Shepherd’s Calendar—Boccaccio—Mr Stoll’s Essays—Lullabies and Fiction.

MR G. B. HARRISON’S ‘**A Second Elizabethan Journal**’ (Constable) is a literary lucky-bag, something to be dipped into with the reward of good instalments of gossip. It should be a happy hunting-ground (how easily changeable may be these figures of speech !) for historians and novelists as giving hints and colouring the atmosphere of olden days. This record covers the years 1595 to 1598. The Armada was still a burning recent memory, and the knowledge of continued Spanish designs against the Sovereignty of England a cause of anxiety to the queen and her counselors. Spenser was the poet of the day, but Master Shakespeare was regularly producing his plays. His great hour was to come. Essex and Drake, after the Queen, were the most prominent actors on the stage of public life, with Burleigh the very real power behind the throne. Cecil was a great man, proved through his works and his inward mind. Suffering his slow dying this was his softly-spoken prayer, ‘O, what a heart is this that will not let me die ! Come, Lord Jesus, one drop of death, Lord Jesus !’ One drop of death ! His Precepts to his son have a Polonius shrewdness. ‘Towards thy superiors be humble yet generous ; with thy equals familiar yet respective ; towards thy inferiors show much humility and some familiarity. . . . The first prepares the way for thy advancement ; the second makes thee known as a man well-bred ; the third gains a good report which once gotten is easily kept.’ The foregoing volume, by culling passages from available books and documents, shows one way of recalling the conditions and atmosphere of a past age ; another hardly less attractive and more reliable way may result from the study and interpretation of family and local letters, accounts, and records. Miss Gladys Scott Thomson has chosen this second way in her

investigations into 'Two Centuries of Family History' (Longmans); going back to the first evident beginnings of the famous Russell Family and tracing its vague and diverse ramifications to the second Earl of Bedford; from whom descended the early-Victorian Lord John Russell and the present Earl, whose intellectual independence and energy are fully in keeping with the qualities of his earliest verifiable ancestors. The word verifiable is a necessary adjunct to all efforts after pedigree-tracing when we realise the trouble taken, as Miss Thomson shows, in the not so distant past, to follow a line of ancestry to Adam, Eve, Methusaleh, and Seth; and in the case of that unpleasant first King James to Brutus, Noah, and Woden. We return to the present day. Sir Ernest Benn is always refreshing in style and vigour, however depressing his subject may be, and few subjects are more depressing than that dealt with in 'Account Rendered' (Benn). He takes as his text Mr A. P. Herbert's lines ending,

'Let's find out what every one is doing,
And then stop every one from doing it.'

Bureaucracy and officialdom are stifling the life of this country—they have spread, are spreading, and must be checked, if we are to be saved. Sir Ernest contrasts the Victorian and the present ages, balancing one against the other, and the result must give his readers furiously to think. He shows the basis of our success in trade and government in the past and exposes the present tendencies of so-called social reform, and universal interference with the individual, hampering trade and making progress almost impossible with the interminable restrictions. The result might almost be summed up in Mr Jerningham's words in Sir Philip Gibbs' latest novel 'The Winding Lane':

'In this country the hard-working man, the ambitious man, the thrifty man is penalised by the idler, the ne'er do well, the degenerate, the unfit, the unlucky. They expect to be supported, and not in vain. That class is being enlarged and encouraged by the politician in search of votes who promises further benefits to the work shy, at the expense of the industrious, with the intention of pauperising the whole nation and making them state-supported slaves.'

London is a subject of perennial interest on which

countless books have been written. There is, however, still room for such a work as 'London and its Government,' by Mr Percy A. Harris (Dent). Whether we look on London from the point of view of history, art, politics, or drains, its administrative development from early times, through the old independent and often non-co-operative parish councils to the present London County Council and twenty-eight borough councils—not to mention the City Corporation—it is an interesting study. Mr Harris has little favour for the City Corporation with its vested and immovable privileges. In 1837 a Commission reported that 'there is a manifest absurdity in attaching political and municipal privileges to the nominees of Corporations which claim to be private, independent of the City, and irresponsible.' Yet this 'manifest absurdity' remains. After an informing survey of earlier history, guilds, and City companies, and the struggles for change and improvement, Mr Harris brings us to the old Metropolitan Board of Works, which, though often abused, did much good work. By 1875 we are told, 'The common needs of London had forced this mere drainage board, only indirectly elected, to be possessed of great powers. As the first recognition of London's unity it did great service; it showed the possibilities of centralised government; it paved the way for the County Council.' Mr Harris gives interesting chapters on education, poverty and unemployment, health, housing, traffic, bridges, parks, squares, water, gas, electricity, and police; all subjects of importance to the Londoner, and he shows, indeed, that the Metropolis is a living organism, an old plant ever throwing off young shoots.

An unhappy book, because of the sad condition of Austria in these days, is this long appreciative reminiscential study of 'The Emperor Karl' (Putnam), written by Arthur, Count Polzer-Hoditz, who as friend and counsellor of the latest, possibly the last, Austrian Emperor knew him intimately and, therefore, writes with bias on the kindly side. If ever an empire lived under the shadow of doom it was Austro-Hungary in the last fifty years, with its aging ruler, its innumerable discordant constituent nationalities, the pride and restlessness of the Hungarians, and the influence of Prussia mischievously assertive in the background. The Emperor Karl,

evidently, and not only from the witness of this volume, an attractive, well-intentioned man, succeeded to a hopeless task. He failed; and through his failure the conditions grew worse. Chaos resulted, and as to the future, we still cannot tell what the settlement or the end may be. Of one conclusion, Count Polzer-Hoditz is confident. In his dismal summing-up he asserts that union with the German Reich would be bad for German-Austria; thereby going against the views of other Austrophils in their despair. Not the least interesting of these pages are those telling the brief story of the mysterious Johann Orth. Professor Charles Guignebert's '**Short History of the French People**' (Allen and Unwin) naturally suffers from compression, as must all such records of a nation born among the mists and as active in war, politics, the arts and industry as the French; but the main facts are there, and the two volumes have the qualities of clearness and straightforwardness of thought and statement, which make it helpful. Possibly these advantages are due to the circumstance that originally it took the form of lectures delivered to American soldiers in France in consequence of the War. We have tested its fairness; and the Dreyfus Case, with the story of the Commune after the Siege of Paris in 1871 are invariably excellent test-examples of its spirit which we find generally honest and broad-minded. The work concludes with a statement, written with evident anxiety, of the prospects of France after the War, with a Germany greater than she in population and naturally determined to recover her strengths. These passages explain, and to some extent justify, the fevers of French politics in the last fourteen years. The translator, who has done his work admirably, should not have referred to the recent German Emperor as the 'Emperor of Germany.' That is a flaw that should not appear in such a work as this. We have received the third of a series of six comprehensive volumes, detailing the history and political development of the state of Chile, '**The Dawn**' (Benn), by Dr Agustin Edwards. In the circumstances, with only half the vast work done, a detailed criticism now would be little helpful; therefore, we merely record the fact of the existence of the work which seems full, fair, and excellent; and mark the truth, as is illustrated supremely by the British

Exhibition in Argentina, that the more we know of the history of the South American States the better.

The last book of Fridtjof Nansen—most honourable of finely serviceable men!—is curiously incomplete, so far, at any rate, as the title promises. '**Through the Caucasus to the Volga**' (Allen and Unwin) would appear to offer a balanced study and description of the places, people, and circumstances seen during such a journey; but although Dr Nansen went through provinces of south-eastern Europe and south-western Asia as yet but little visited, he has mainly treated certain aspects of them, leaving other aspects untouched. For example, his passing-through Georgia prompts him, for about a fifth of the whole book, to describe the rise more than a hundred years ago of Muridism, in protest against the ambitions and brutalities of imperial Russia, with an account of the extraordinary career of that prince of mountaineer-fighters Shamyl; while the interesting conditions of the present time are generally overlooked. Also, having crossed the Caspian, he describes with detail the super-abundant fisheries of the Volga, and little else of that region. So far as it goes, therefore, the book is excellent; but rather like one course of a banquet being offered where a full, sufficient meal was expected. A map would have helped. Sir Richard Burton and Mr Eldon Rutter, with their famous descriptions of pilgrimages to Mecca, have handicapped all subsequent accounts of the kind; and for fullness and richness of narrative Mr Hedley Churchward's '**From Drury Lane to Mecca**' (Sampson Low) comes a long way after. He had some advantages over those fore-runners with the better books. Through conversion he was a genuine Mohammedan, and, therefore, needed no disguise or subterfuge to bear him to the sacred places of Islam; and, with excellent courage, he carried a camera for hidden use. Also, being a scene-painter, he could draw; so that his book is improved with almost unique pictures of the Kaaba and other shrines for the devout. His story is told with simplicity and humour, and while his accounts of Mecca and its personalities are globe-trotterish, his narrative of the journey on a ship smitten with small-pox is thrilling. The introduction by Mr Eric Rosenthal, describing Churchward the man is curiously done, and

contains such extraordinary statements as that Queen Victoria had an especial weakness for plaice, and that the Lord prefixed to George Sanger's name was baptismal ; which it was not.

Every page of Mr Shan F. Bullock's volume of remembrance, '**After Sixty Years**' (Sampson Low), impresses with its truth ; often a grey truth, but yet instinct with sympathy. Here is a work that easily might be overlooked ; and therefore we draw attention to it. It is a part of Ulster life, sincere and well-endowed with those virtues, sometimes dour but ever steadfast, which have established Ulstermen as outstandingly reliable of faith and deed. We are given a picture of Irish agricultural life as it was sixty years ago, so vivid that it is not difficult to understand why this author preferred an official and literary career in London to the service of the harsh acres his fathers had tilled. Some day he may tell us of the after-years, when he was writing his more than score of books that never have had their due appreciation. Meanwhile, we welcome these earlier pages of his biography, to which Sir Horace Plunkett, that great patriot, gives a prefatory blessing. Sad and bad as in many ways the fight—too truly a fight—for Women's Suffrage was, it had its heroisms and martyrs ; as well as its meannesses and follies ; and in Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, '**The Suffragette Movement**' (Longmans) has found its effective historian. She writes with an inherited eloquence and spirit and, having lived her part in the foremost fighting, is able to speak with the authority of one who knows its intimate truths, while the personal zest of the book is enhanced through the evident rift in a sisterly lute that it discloses. One of the few good things resulting from the outbreak of the War was the ending of those horrid divisions, cleaving the unity of families and of political parties, over Votes for Women, which had made public life sour and cruel for some bitter years. Looking backward and seeing how admirably women are serving the community as the equal colleagues of men, what an ugly unnecessary fuss was then caused ! The ugliness, as well as the spiritual courage of it, are clearly shown in this book ; though, of course, Miss Pankhurst is on the side of her angels ; and takes good care that those 'Anti' dogs shan't get the best of it ! It is, on the whole, a

noble-hearted book, worthy of the daughter of 'a standard-bearer of every forlorn hope'—her generally overlooked father.

For not far short of a hundred years the Darwin-Murray controversy as to the character of the formation of barrier reefs and atolls has mildly raged, while indirectly it led to the expedition described by Dr C. M. Yonge in '**A Year on the Great Barrier Reef**' (Putnams). Yet the difference has not been settled, though the suggestion is now made that probably both sides were in some way right. The expedition was well-found and well-managed, while its object was worthy of the best scientific endeavour. The Barrier that fringes almost half the eastern seaboard of Australia is nothing more than gigantic submarine mountain-chains of limestone formed by the gradual accumulation of the skeletons of corals. 'It is a thing staggering to the imagination,' says Dr Yonge, 'that animals so simple in structure can build a rampart 1260 miles long, many miles wide, and not less than 180 feet high.' But does not Nature ever appal through such marvels and mysteries, making man with his ambitions appear often a commonplace biped? This work provides attractive reading, and is sometimes finely expressed—the passage on p. 140 on the miracle of a coral reef is excellently imaginative in its truth.

Endeavours to secure a universal language among the nations, since Babel brought confusion of tongues to the Earth, have been frequent; but all have failed. Cranks and amateur etymologists have done their worst. Volapuk came and went; Esperanto followed and was found wanting. Such hybrid tongues as those are like the proverbial mule—of doubtful ancestry and without hope of posterity. But here is a more reasonable suggestion and form of speech, the idea of a trustworthy student of the English language, Professor R. E. Zachrisson of the University of Upsala, who has issued pamphlets justifying his idea. '**Anglic**' is merely a simplification—not quite so simple as may appear—of the current English tongue. Ours being by far the nearest approach to a universal language in the world, and now understood by some two hundred millions of people, it is a sensible thought to make it easier to foreigners by using phonetic spelling.

'To the averij English reedr the kaes mae be sumd up as foloz: Jeneraly speeking we, non-Anglo-Saxonz, hav noe reezn to prefur English to udhr langgwijez, but the whole wurd wonts it for internashonal purpusez. What is an advaantij to us, wil aulsoe be an advaantij to you. Now, this very much dezierd end kan be reecht much mor eezily if you konsent to reform your speling. This is komen sens, and I am konvinst there ar noe staunshr beleeverz in komen sens than you.'

Well, that is that! We have no wish to discourage this spirited and it may be helpful venture; but there is no immediate intention of printing the 'Quarterly Review' in words of such strange guise.

We cannot too warmly approve Miss Edith Hamilton's exposition of 'The Greek Way' (Dent). Admirable in style, diction, and thought, it so well justifies the culture of ancient Greece that especially those, not a few, who have been cold to the Hellenic appeal, remembering the people in their political quarrels and meanness rather than in their wonderful artistic achievements and spiritual greatness, should read it. The greatness of Greece is well brought out and the miracle that went with it; for it was no slowly prepared blossoming of immortal fruits coming at last to light; but a sudden amazing glory different from all that had gone before, inasmuch as it soared over pain and death, those burdens of the habitual thought of imperial Egypt, and brought with it joy and gladness, games, and the spirit of play. The powers of magic and of fear for the time were banished; but, alas, only for the time, as the credulities and priestcraft under which those dark influences had come to tyrannous strength revived and, until the Renaissance, the world lost the Greek Way. Miss Hamilton has admirably realised the truth of the extraordinary freedom of Attic thought, a truth the clearer because of its supreme and almost solitary exception in the martyrdom of Socrates; while she points out delicately and effectively the great humanity and passion of the supreme Greek tragic dramatists, those poets for all time. And as if to illustrate something of the spiritual furniture of the Greek mind there comes with it a new work offered to the world of scholarship by President William Sherwood Fox of the University of Western Ontario: 'Greek and Roman

Mythology (Williams and Norgate). Well-known, and very well-known, as are the ancient tales of the heroes and the gods, their religious interpretation gives the old themes freshness; and the many illustrations, reproduction of statues, wall-paintings, and designs on vases, add light and loveliness to the book. The author's method of spelling the proper names is somewhat discouraging through being inconsistent. If Achilles and Cyprus may remain, why need we have Oidipous and Kallisto, as they are equally familiar to English readers; and such familiarity is the plea for leaving some and altering others? Having made that mild protest, rather to add colour to the subsequent benediction than to find fault with the book, we can proceed to bless. It is an admirable piece of work; probably the better for not being easy reading. The truth is that these ancient myths, showing how human and naughty the deities could be, too often have been regarded—and happily read by younger minds—as mere fairy-tales, jewels of romance. But, of course, they are vastly more than that.

Let us confess that in the beginning of M. Jean Marie Carre's study of '**Robert Louis Stevenson**' (Noel Douglas) we were put off by the sentimental sub-title '**The Frail Warrior**,' and by such a carelessness on the part of the translator as, 'I have not held to the legend that has grown up since his death in England.' The right construction or punctuation of that sentence would have prevented its untruth. Other slips also, due to the translation from the French, made by an American, must be noted. '**Prometheus Freed**' for Shelley's poem; '**Arthur's Chair**' near Edinburgh; '**The Hon. Mr Gladstone**,' and '**lyric cord**,' for chord; while Abbotsford is assuredly not '**a romantic ruinous chateau**.' The effect of such errors is, however, slight, compared with the quality of the book. Poor Stevenson has been sadly mishandled by the biographers; both of the ambitious lives of him being woefully insufficient, so that, until now, this critical appreciation from the pen of a Frenchman is the most sympathetically true. It is frank enough, being, indeed, more revealing of the whole man than were Sir Graham Balfour's and Mr Steuart's volumes; the quarrel with Henley, rather exaggeratedly called '**incarnate intellect**,' and the difficult character of Mrs Stevenson

being dealt with. It is possible then no one will fully limn in words that evasive personality, but, so far as at present may be, the living 'R. L. S.' is here.

Any selection of the 'Poems of Blake' (Macmillan) has its excitement to his followers; and this selection, chosen and edited by Mr Laurence Binyon, is the more interesting because, a poet himself wearing lustrous bays and an expert critic of pictorial art, he speaks with unusual authority. Blake, however, like the rainbow, appears different to every observer, because the angle of vision for every observer is different; but we must question, at least as eminently debatable, the assertion that Blake was greater as an artist than as a poet. The truth is that his art and poetry were mutually dependent. To see but one of those aspects is to see him incompletely; and such bald comparison, therefore, is of small avail. And so to 'Christina Rossetti' (Macmillan). With reverence and a scrupulous choice of words which sometimes has destroyed their helpful impulsiveness, Miss Dorothy M. Stuart has paid her tribute, and added a strengthening volume to the 'Men of Letters' Series. She has shown an excellent discrimination in her judgment of the relative values of Miss Rossetti's poems, and rightly has seen the weakness, the inequalities, which often were merged with the excellence. Yet the poet has passed her centenary and possibly wields a wider influence over the thoughtful and religious-minded public than before. It may be that Christina's sad grey spirit of contemplation helps these times which so recently were passing through fiery and angry ordeals. The joy of her muse was certainly subdued, and always an element of wistfulness softened her sedate playfulness. It is a pity that her environment or upbringing kept her imagination within cloistered limits, for it was a lovely and Blake-like dream that she had of the wave of yellow light sweeping at dawn from the trees of Regent's Park, as the captive canaries of London there nightly assembled winged their ways back to their cages. Such vision might have been extended. It is on a far higher plane than that of her rigidly orthodox elder sister who would not visit the mummy-room of the British Museum lest the resurrection of the dead happened while she was there!

'The Shepherd's Calendar' (Scholartis Press) has,

of course, its interest to Spenserians, whether they are studying the poet's art or searching for details of his self-biography ; but it is not very satisfying in either respect. Professor W. L. Renwick has done his best to point the many uncertain passages of the twelve Eclogues ; and as he has avoided the temptation offered to every editor for taking chances and jumping to conjectural conclusions, as, for example, in the impossible identification of the various shepherds and shepherdesses who play poetically at minding their flocks on the slopes of Olympus, he has little that is positive to add to the stock of information already possessed. Partly through Spenser's incompleteness in his art at that stage, and partly through his determined reticence over himself, tendencies that made him always the least personally known of the major poets, these Eclogues are chiefly of interest as leading to the greater works, the 'Faerie Queene,' the Epithalamion, and the rest. It is always of interest to see the poet practising and improving in his craft ; and this sound edition of the works, which has now come to the third volume, is for that and other reasons helpful. Next we meet Boccaccio, a supreme romanticist, who himself has become a fictional figure ; and having read his tales of cynical impudence and amusing folly, so frequently set like many modern comedies in a bedroom-scene, who has not mentally visioned, probably wrongly, that grandfather of coloured narrative and decadence ? 'The Life of Giovanni Boccaccio' (Cassell), by Mr Thomas Caldecott Chubb, is another such imaginative effort put into print. Such records as there be Mr Chubb has used, and, of course, the tales are mines for conjecture ; the rest must be author-made. The result in this case is entertaining ; but as fiction, and not history, entertains. It is always pleasant to welcome works of constructive literary criticism from America ; and because of Mr Elmer Edgar Stoll's recent volume of Shakespearean studies, we opened with pleasant anticipation his 'Poets and Playrights,' published by the University of Minnesota Press, consisting of essays on various aspects of the works of Ben Jonson, Spenser, Milton, and Shakespeare. The work is uneven ; it does not add to its writer's reputation, while the quality of some of the examples falls beneath his average. How rarely is it wise, after a feast of merit

enjoyed, to serve up an odd meal of made-up dishes, as this book seems to be !

What truly is a lullaby ? Is it not a cradle song for infant ears, or at least for those of young children, to help them to drift through the evasive gates of sleep ? But that is not the view of Mr F. E. Budd, the compiler of 'A Book of Lullabies' (Eric Partridge), chosen from English poetry from the beginning of the thirteenth to the end of the nineteenth century. He asserts that a lullaby is predominantly serious, 'written by adults for the reading of adults.' That is a doubtful statement, for although it increases the bulk of his slight volume it takes much helpful simplicity out of it. He prints the dreadful 'imitation,' by Thomas Warton the younger, of Shakespeare's delicious 'Philomel, with melody,' making it rather the song for Nick Bottom's ass-ears than for the darkening dreams of Titania. That is an instance, we venture to think, of where Mr Budd goes wrong ; and it is the more a pity because the true lullaby, such as Tennyson's 'Sweet and Low,' and Christina Rossetti's 'Lullaby, Oh Lullaby !' is so exquisite a thing. It is also stretching a point to perdition to reprint in this book 'The Lullaby of a Female Convict to her Child the Night Previous to Execution' ; by Gosse's 'insipid poetaster,' Henry Kirke White :

'Sleep baby mine, enkerchieft on my bosom,
Thy cries they pierce again my bleeding breast,'

and so on. Dreadful !

Finally three works of fiction of particular worth. The novels of Stella Benson are unique, for no other writer has mixed in the ink used quite the same rare quality of humorous, luminous fantasy as she has done. 'Tobit Translated' (Macmillan) is her best, her most subtly wise and witty, most ambitious book. Delicious is the word for it. Her Tobit is a White Russian, fallen to poverty in Manchuria. He remembers a debt and sends his son to Seoul to reclaim the money due. The angel accompanying Tobit is a glib super-wordly-wise Chinese law-student of the Middle Temple, whose mis-used up-to-date English is a joy. Quite naturally Miss Benson is able, in these topsy-turvy days of Russians in exile, to parallel the story of the forlorn Jews of the

Apocrypha. But the atmosphere is her own, and with charm and art she develops the irony that sharpens the misadventures of her people. Doubtless they live, for we see in them much the same inconsequence and obstinate lingering on the threshold of tragedy as are realised in the novels of Dostoevsky and in 'The Cherry Orchard'; but her puppets are different from those of the Russian masters, being garbed in a kindly radiance of fantastic humour and wit.

It is always a pleasure to come across books which outwardly in print and binding, as inwardly in literary distinction, are out of the ordinary. Such are the Bennington Books, published by the Scholartis Press. A recent addition is 'Cats' Meat and Kings,' by George Baker, a volume of stories of unusual merit. John Fenn, the fiercely independent and puritan old countryman and his disastrous odyssey to London; Richard Pannett, born in a cats'-meat shop with the yearnings of a paladin, without any of the paladin's vitality; April Ffoulkes, spinster and sentimentalist; John Jenkins, clerk and evangelist, and his one glorious hour of life and beauty with Kitty Kemp, divorcée and professional dancer; Hugh Moore, sordid and weak transgressor and sentimentalist—all are living characters, drawn with insight, sympathy, and even such melodrama as the case demands. If it be objected that the stories are on the whole sombre and end in tragedy, well, so do many incidents of real life, yet the reading of them can be well worth while. So much that is called 'historical' in fiction is incompetent and fustian, or worse, anachronisms of deed and phrase lurking to trip up the writers, that it is a cause of satisfaction, as well as an act of duty towards those seeking literary good things, to recommend 'The Ravens Enter the House' (Murray). Miss Ivory Burnett is an accepted historian, although her pen-name does not disclose the fact; and she writes with vision, zest, and charm, as well as, of course, with truth. Her romance is placed in the wild covenanting times of Scotland, a period of worldly and spiritual darkness that also had its lights; and both the tragedy and the beauty possible then are expressed in this romance which moves and stirs more thoroughly, because more sincerely, than can any mere shocker.

APR 28 1914

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH VOLUME OF THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

Acland Report on Forestry and Afforestation, 377, 378, 380-381, 386.

Agriculture, condition of, in England up to the close of the sixteenth century, 111-120.

Airships, question of their practicability, 178—development of, 178-180—performances of, 180-182—review of disasters, 182-186—essentials for safety, 186-187—as a means of oceanic transport, 187-189—attitude to, of foreign powers, 189-190—the need for continued experiment, 190-191.

Alexander, Prince of Bulgaria, 3.

Andrews, C. F., editor of 'Mahatma Gandhi: His own Story,' 388-399.

Arber, Professor, editor of 'Toxophilus,' 96—of 'The Scholemaster,' 96.

Archer, Mr., on the handling of official fishery returns, 344.

'Armées Françaises dans la Grande Guerre, Les,' Tome I, vol. II et annexe, 22—allusions to, 28, 29—extracts from, 31 *note*, 32.

Army slang, influence of India upon, 347-348.

Arnold, Matthew, allusion to his 'Discourses in America,' 176.

Ascham, Roger, 96-110.

Ascham, Roger, career of, 96-99—extracts from his 'Scholemaster,' 99, 102—his book 'A Report on the Affairs and State of Germany,' 99—quotations from letters, 100-101—his treatise on archery, 'Tox-

ophilus,' 101-102, 106—ideas on education, 102-103—epistolary skill, 108—championship of the English language, 108-110.

Austria, The Future of, 150-158.

Austria, effects of the Treaty of St Germain upon, 151-152, 154, 157—economic position, 153-155—compared with Switzerland, 155-157—question of union with Germany, 157-158.

B.

Bailey, John, 'Queen Victoria,' 1.

Baker, George, 'Cats' Meat and Kings,' 414.

Barton, Captain F. R., C.M.G., 'Some New Letters of Edward FitzGerald,' 290.

Bass Rock, occupation of, by Lord Middleton, 318.

Bell, Mrs G. H., 'The Hamwood Papers,' 200-201.

Benedictine Rule, the, 165-166.

Benn, Sir Ernest, 'Account Rendered,' 403.

Benson, A. C., 'Edward FitzGerald,' 290-295.

Benson, Claude E., Oxford—Cambridge; Cambridge—Oxford,' 40.

Benson, Stella, 'Tobit Translated,' 413-414.

Bentham, Jeremy, writings of, 206, 210, 224.

Bentwich, Norman, O.B.E., M.C., Attorney-General of Palestine, 'The Mandates System,' 261, 274-275, 278.

- Berkeley, Bishop, 67, 77—his 'Commonplace Book,' 67—extract from 'Discourse on Passive Obedience,' 73.
- Berry, Dr Henry F., extract from his 'A History of the Royal Dublin Society,' 71 *note*.
- Besant, Mrs Annie, on the will to work, 217.
- Bindon, Francis, 68.
- Binyon, Mr Laurence, editor of 'Poems of Blake,' 411.
- Bismarck, Prince, 4, 8, 9-10, 14.
- Blackstone, on constitutional government, 368.
- Blyth, E. M. E., 'Mahatma Gandhi: A Study in Destructiveness,' 388.
- Bolshevism, aims of, 79, 82, 85, 94—claims to recognition, 95.
- Boswell, James, allusion to St Kilda, 144-145.
- Boyd, William, 'Towards a New Education,' 51.
- Brailsford, M. R., 'The Making of William Penn,' 195.
- Bremer, Captain Mountstevens, 'Memories of a Ceylon Planter,' 203.
- Bright, John, on adulteration, 211.
- British Year Book of International Law, 1921-1922..261 *note*, 262 *note*—1924..269 *note*—1930..274 *note*.
- Broadcasting, 61.
- Brooke, Henry, 68.
- Brophy, John, 'Songs and Slang of the British Soldier, 1914-1918,' 347—allusions to, 348-350.
- Brown, Hume, extract from his 'History of Scotland,' 147.
- Browning, Robert, 'Life of Stratford,' 360, 361, 375—extract from, 367.
- Buchanan, George, allusion to his 'History of Scotland,' 141.
- Buckle, George Earle, editor of 'The Letters of Queen Victoria' (3rd Series), 1, 2-3—extracts from, 5 *et seq.*
- Buckmaster, Rt Hon. Lord, on perjury, 224-225.
- Budd, Mr F. E., compiler of 'A Book of Lullabies,' 413.
- Bullock, Mr Shan F., 'After Sixty Years,' 407.
- Burghclere, Lady, 'Stratford,' 360, 361, 362, 365, 369, 375—extracts from, 365-366 373-374.
- Burnett, Miss Ivory, 'The Ravens Enter the House,' 414.
- Burney, Commander Sir Dennistoun Bart., 'The World, the Air and the Future,' 187 *note*, 189 *note*.

C.

Cambridge—Oxford; Oxford—Cambridge, 40-50.

'Cambridge History of English Literature,' on Roger Ascham, 107.

Carlyle, Thomas, extract from 'Friedrich the Great,' 211.

Carre, M. Jean Marie, 'Robert Louis Stevenson,' 410-411.

Cauchon, Pierre, Bishop of Beauvais, 254, 256.

Charles Edward Stuart, the Young Pretender, help given to, by French Privateers, 325-331.

Chartism, 212.

Chubb, Mr Thomas Caldecott, 'The Life of Giovanni Boccaccio,' 412.

Church, Dean, on the cloister-life at Bec, 164.

Churchill, Rt Hon. Winston, 'The World Crisis, 1916-1918,' Part I, 22—extract from, 26—extracts from his introduction to 'Liason, 1914,' by Brig.-Gen. E. L. Spears, 22, 29.

Churchward, Mr Hedley, 'From Drury Lane to Mecca,' 406-407.

Civil Trials, English procedure in, 229-231, 232, 233—German method of conducting, 231, 232-233.

Clergerie, General, allusion to his book 'Le Rôle du Gouvernement militaire de Paris,' 37.

Clough, A. H., quotation from 'The Latest Decalogue,' 211.

Cole, G. H. D., 'Social Theory,' 205.

Commercial Court, the, 234.

Communist Party in Russia, 86, 93-94.

Concerning the Woodcock, 302-314.

Conseil permanent Internationale pour l'Exploration de la Mer, publications of, 332.

Coulton, G. G., *D.Litt.*, 'The Meaning of Monasticism,' 159.

Courtneidge, Robert, 'I was an Actor Once,' 202-203.

Criminal Evidence Act, 1898. .226.

Cromwell, on constitutional government, 368.

D.

'Daily Telegraph, The,' for Dec. 2, 1930, extract from, 224.

Dawn of Modern Farming, The, 111-131.

Decline and Fall of Socialism, The, 205-222.

Delany, Dean, 68.

Denman, Lord Chief Justice, on the prohibition of certain evidence, 226.

Dickens, Charles, extract from 'Hard Times,' 211-212.

Disraeli, Rt Hon. Benjamin, extracts from his 'Sybil,' 207, 212-213.

Divorce Law in England, inadequacy of, 227-228.

Drewar, Captain, sees a sea-serpent, 236-237.

Dublin Society, The Royal, and its Bicentenary, 63-77.

Dunlop, Robert, 'The Future of Austria,' 150.

E.

Eckener, Dr Hugo, 181.

Edmonds, Brig.-General J. E., 'Military Operations, France and Belgium, 1914' . .22.

Edwards, Dr Augustin, 'The Dawn,' 405-406.

Education and the Film, 51-62.

Education, increasing interest taken in, 51—development of, 52-55.

Eel, results of investigations into the spawning of the, 340-341.

Elizabeth, Queen, as a scholar, 98-99—grief at the death of Ascham, 99.

Ellis-Fermor, Miss U. M., editor of Marlowe's 'Tamburlaine the Great,' 197.

'Encyclopædia Britannica' (ninth edition) on the woodcock, 309.

d'Esperey, General Franchet, in command of French 5th Army, 34—plan for an offensive on the Marne adopted by Joffre, 34-35.

Eve, Hon. Mr Justice, on perjury, 224, 225.

F.

'Fabian Essays in Socialism,' 205, 215-216.

Fabian Society, formation of, 213—its influence on English Socialism, 214-215—work of, 216, 218.

Fairholm, on the woodcock, in the 'Museum of Animated Nature,' 309-310.

Farming, Modern, The Dawn of, 111-131.

Figgis, Rev. Father, allusion to a sermon by, 170.

Film, The, and Education, 51-62.

Film, power of the, 60.

Film Producers, failure of, to co-operate with teachers, 56, 57.

Firth, Sir C. H., editor of 'Papers Relating to Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford,' 360, 362.

Fishery Investigations, The International, 332-346.

Fishery Investigations, establishment of International Council for, 332—work of International Council, 332-333, 334-335, 336-346—Great Britain's share in, 333, 335-336.

FitzGerald, Edward, 279-301.

FitzGerald, Edward, 'Meadows in Spring,' 279-280, 288—upbringing of, 280-281—friendships of, 281, 282-283, 286-287, 296—'Euphrator,' 281, 282, 283-285, 288—works of, 288, 300-301—marriage of, 289—letters from, 290-297—his version of Omar Khayyam's 'Rubaiyat,' 297-300.

Fitzgerald, Professor G. F., 70 and *note*.

Five Years' Plan, Russia and the, 78-95.

Five Years' Plan. See Russia.

Forestry Commission in Great Britain, The, 377-387.

Forestry Commission, work of the, 378-380—extracts from Report of the first ten years' working of, 381-384—future work of, 386-387.

Forrest, Mr H. T. S., 'The Original "Venus and Adonis,"' 199.

Fox, President William Sherwood, 'Greek and Roman Mythology,' 409-410.

French, Field-Marshal Viscount, '1914' . .22—his first interview with General Laurezac, 24.

French Privateers and Scottish Jacobites, 315-331.

Fülöp-Miller, Rene, 'Lenin and Gandhi,' 388—extracts from, 388, 393, 396, 399, 401.

G.

Gallieni, General, plans for an attack on the German flank, 33, 35—his part in the Battle of the Marne, 35-38.

'Gallieni, Memoires du Maréchal,' Défense de Paris, 22, 32—allusions to, 35, 36.

Gandhi, Mahatma: a Study in Destructiveness, 388-401.

Gandhi, early life of, 389-391—work in South Africa, 391-394—efforts to abolish indentured labour in India, 394-395—recruiting campaign, 395-397—his fight against the Rowlatt Act, 398-399—effects of his work for India, 400-401.

Gardiner, Dr S. R., 'Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford,' 360, 361, 362, 373.

Garnett, Dr, on English blank verse, 108—on Roger Ascham, 110.

Gascoigne, Thomas, on English monks, 161.

George, Henry, 'Progress and Poverty,' 213.

German South-West Africa, conditions of Mandate of the South African Union for, 272-273.

Gibbon, Edward, on Monasticism, 163-164.

Gibbs, Sir Philip, extract from 'The Winding Lane,' 403.

Giles, Dr, editor of the 'Complete Works of Roger Ascham,' 96.

Gladstone, Rt Hon. W. E., conversion to Home Rule, 2, 3—accepts office in 1886 .5-6, 14, 17.

Glyde, John, 'Life of Edward Fitzgerald,' 290.

Gordon, Douglas, 'Concerning the Woodcock,' 302.

Gore, Rt Rev. Bishop, 'The Philosophy of the Good Life,' 194.

Gorell, Lord, 'Education and the Film,' 51.

Gott, Sir Benjamin, on designing schools to take modern equipment, 59-60.

Gould, Lieut-Commander R. T., R.N., 'The Case for the Sea Serpent,' 236.

Grant, Edward, editor of 'Familiarium Epistolarum Libri Tres,' 96.

Gras, N. S. B. and E. C., 'The Economic and Social History of an English Village,' 111, 119.

Great Britain, The Forestry Commission in, 377-387.

Guignebert, Professor Charles, 'Short History of the French People,' 405.

Gurner, Ronald, 'Day Schools of England,' 51, 58.

H.

Haines, C. R., 'Sea Monsters,' 236.

Hakluyt, Richard, 'The Principle Navigators, Voyages, etc., of the English Nation,' 236—extracts from, 238-239.

Hamblen, Miss Emily S., 'On the Minor Prophecies of William Blake,' 197-198.

Hamilton, Alexander, extract from 'The Federalist,' 368.

Hamilton, Miss Edith, 'The Greek Way,' 409.

Harbrow, Mr Dudley, 'Amphion,' 201.

Harris, Mr Percy A., 'London and its Government,' 404.

Harrison, Mr G. B., 'A Second Elizabethan Journal,' 402.

Hedges, F. A. Mitchell, 'Battles with Giant Fish,' 236, 244, 248.

Herbert, Auberon, 'An Appeal for Liberty,' 217.

Hewett, Rev. G. M. A., on the woodcock, 309.

Hirst, W. A., 'The Decline and Fall of Socialism,' 205.

Hoare, Rt Hon. Sir Samuel, 'The Fourth Seal,' 193-194.

la Hogue, Battle of, 319.

Hone, J. M., 'The Royal Dublin Society and its Bicentenary,' 63.

Humphreys, Hon. Mr Justice, on perjury, 225.

Hutchinson, Horace G., 'Edward Fitzgerald,' 279.

Hyndman, founder of the Social Democratic Federation, 213-214—on the Fabians, 217.

I.

- Independent Labour Party, foundation of, 214, 218.
 'Indian Opinion,' organ of Gandhi's views in South Africa, 393.
 International Fishery Investigations, *The*, 332-346.
 Iraq, conditions of British Mandate for, 273-274.
 'Ireland's Peril,' a republican pamphlet, extract from, 74.

J.

- Jacobites, settlement of, in Brittany, 321.
 James II, flight to France, 316-317—death of, 320.
 James Stuart, the Old Pretender, attempts to invade Scotland, 321-325.
 Jameson, Miss Storm, 'The Decline of Merry England,' 201-202.
 Jenkins, J. Travis, 'The International Fishery Investigations,' 332.
 Joan of Arc, *The Real*, 249-260.
 Joan of Arc, religious faith of, 250-251, 254-259—personality of, 251-252, 259-260.
 Jocelin of Brakelond, allusion to his 'Chronicle,' 173-175.
 Joffre, General, criticism of, 29-30—extracts from his General Instructions, 30, 31—his interview with Sir John French before the Battle of the Marne, 38-39.
 John of Ayton, on English monks, 161.
 Johnson, Dr Samuel, on education, 52—on Samuel Madden, 66—on St Kilda, 145—on Roger Ascham, 101—on Monasticism, 163.
 Johnson, W. Branch, 'French Privateers and Scottish Jacobites,' 315.

K.

- Kilda, *St. Past and Present*, 132-149.
 Kingsley, Charles, on the Chartists, 212.
 Kleinwaechter, Dr F. F. G., 'Self-Determination for Austria,' 150, 157, 158.

Knowler, W., editor of 'Letters and Despatches of the Earl of Stratford,' 360, 361.

L.

- Labourer, English, history of, 206-207.
 Lamb, Charles, on poetry of Edward FitzGerald, 279.
 Land tenure, forms of, 113-114, 116, 117.
 Lang, Andrew, on Roger Ascham, 102.
 Lanrezac, General, commanding the French 5th Army, 22—his lack of co-operation with the British, 23-28.
 Laski, Professor Harold, on the ideas of John Stuart Mill, 209.
 Laud, Archbishop, his advice to Strafford, 374.
 League of Nations, Covenant of, Article 22..265-266, 270, 274—Permanent Mandates Commission, 266, 268, 269, 275-278.
 Lecky, 'Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,' 63, 69—on the Royal Dublin Society, 65.
 Lee, Sidney, on 'Roger Ascham,' 96.
 Litigation, cost of, 234, 235.
 Lloyd George, Rt Hon. D., expenditure of public money by, 219.
 Locke, John, founder of the Dublin Philosophical Society, 63, 71—his 'Essay Concerning the Human Understanding,' 63.
 Loder, Robert, his success as a farmer, 121-129.
 Loder-Symonds, Captain R. N., 120 *note*.
 Lodge, Eleanor C., 'The Account Book of a Kentish Estate, 1616-1704'..111, 130.
 Louis XV of France, his efforts in the Jacobite cause, 317, 318-319, 320, 328.
 Loyseleur, Nicolas, Canon of Rouen, 254, 255.
 Lugard, Lord, 'The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa,' 265.

M.

- van Maanen Helmer, 'The Mandates System,' 263 *note*.
- Macaulay, Lord, on Dickens' 'Hard Times,' 212—on the Chartists, 212—on Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 362.
- McCardie, Hon. Mr Justice, 'Trust. A Lecture delivered before the Royal Medico-Psychological Association as reported in "The Times" of Nov. 21, 1930'..223—on perjury, 224, 225, 226—on the effect on witnesses of presentation of case by Counsel, 229, 232.
- MacDonald, Rt Hon. J. Ramsay, 'Socialism: Critical and Constructive,' 205, 218.
- MacFarlane's 'Geographical Collections' (vol. III), allusion to, 141.
- MacGregor, Alasdair Alpin, 'St Kilda, Past and Present,' 132.
- MacKechnie, Samuel, 'The Romance of the Civil Service,' 199-200.
- MacKenzie of Tarbat, Sir George, his account of St Kilda, 141-142.
- McNair, Dr Arnold, editor of 'Contributions to International Law and Diplomacy,' 261, 277.
- Madden, Dr John, and the Royal Dublin Society, 64.
- Madden, Samuel, and the Royal Dublin Society, 66, 67, 69, 71, 77.
- Mahatma, meaning of the title, 388.
- Mahatma Gandhi: A Study in Destructiveness, 388-401.
- Maitland, S. R., allusion to his 'Dark Ages,' 164.
- Mandates System, The: Its First Decade, 261-278.
- Mandatory System, origin, 261-265—character, 266-269—development, 269-275—administration, 275-278.
- 'Mandats Internationaux, Les,' 262 *note*, 263 *note*, 269 *note*, 274 *note*, 276 *note*.
- Maple, Mr, of the Royal Dublin Society, 64.
- Maray Firth, position of fisheries in, 344-345.
- Marriott, Sir J. A. R., 'Strafford,' 360.
- Marne, The Battle of the, and the Retreat of 1914..22-39.
- Martin, Martin, on the bird life of St Kilda, 137, 142.
- Marx, Karl, 213, 216.
- Matheson, John, and St Kilda, 133.
- Maurice, Major-General Sir Frederick, K.C.M.G., 'The Retreat of 1914 and the Battle of the Marne,' 22.
- Maurice, Mr H. G., Assistant Secretary for Fisheries, 336, 346.
- Mayor, J. E. B., editor of 'The Scholemaster,' 96—extract from, 102.
- Mechanical Aids to Learning, Exhibition of, 53, 56-57.
- Meyerstein, Mr E. H. W., 'Life of Thomas Chatterton,' 198-199.
- Middle Ages, theology in the, 166-169.
- Mill, John Stuart, 'Principles of Political Economy,' 205, 208, 212—extract from, 210—allusions to his 'Autobiography,' 208-209, 210—treatment of Socialism, 208, 210—interested in land, 213, 216.
- Milton, John, on Monasticism, 162.
- Molyneux, Sir Thomas, 63, 64, 67.
- Molyneux, William, founder of the Dublin Philosophical Society, 63, 64, 71.
- Monasticism, The Meaning of, 159-177.
- Monasticism, sundry views on, 160-164—impartiality necessary for the study of, 164, 167—golden age of, in England, 169-170.
- Monipennie, allusion to his account of St Kilda, 141.
- Monro, Donald, extract from his 'Description of the Western Isles of Scotland called Hybrides,' 140-141.
- More, Sir Thomas, on English monks, 161-162.
- Morris, William, on Hyndman, 214.
- Mullins, Claud, 'Perjury,' 223—'In Quest of Justice,' 230, 232, 234, 235.
- Mumby, Mr Frank A., 'Publishing and Bookselling,' 194-195.
- Muniments, the importance of utilising, 130-131.
- Murray, Margaret Alice, 'The Witch Cult in Western Europe. A Study in Anthropology,' 249, 250-251, 253, 254, 255—extraet from, 257.
- Murray, T. Douglas, editor of 'Jeanne d'Arc, Maid of Orleans, Deliverer

of France, Being the Story of her Life, her Achievements, and her Death, as attested on Oath and Set Forth in the Original Documents,' 249, 250, 257—extract from, 258.

N.

- Nansen, Dr Fridtjof, 'Through the Caucasus to the Volga,' 406.
 Netter of Walden, Thomas, on English monks, 161.
 New Education Fellowship, Fifth International Conference of, 51-52.
 Newman, Edward, editor of the 'Zoologist,' 244.
 Newman, John Henry, 176.
 Norway, favourite locality for sea monsters, 246.

O.

- Oath, contrast in importance attached to, in England and Germany, 233-234.
 Okey, Mr Thomas, 'A Basketful of Memories,' 203-204—' Venice and its Story,' 204.
 Oudemans, A. C., 'The Great Sea Serpent, an Historical Critical Treatise,' 236, 243-244.
 Oxford—Cambridge; Cambridge—Oxford, 40-50.
 Oxford Dictionary, The New, references to, 348 *et seq.*
 Oxford Movement, The, and Monasticism, 164.

P.

- Palestine, conditions of British Mandate for, 274-275.
 Pankhurst, Miss Sylvia, 'The Suffragette Movement,' 407-408.
 Partridge, Eric, 'Soldiers' Slang,' 347.
 Passfield, Lord, on Mill's 'Principles of Political Economy,' 209—on Municipal Socialism, 216.
 Payne-Gallwey, Sir R., on the woodcock in the 'Badminton Library,' 309.
 Pearson, Mr Hesketh, 'Doctor Darwin,' 196.
 Pecoock, Bishop, on English monks, 161.

Perjury, 223-235.

Perjury, prevalence of, in England, 224-225, 226, 233—German Law concerning, 226-227, 232-233—problem of, in Civil Actions, 228-229, 230, 235—German judge's opinion on, in England and Germany, 233.

Perjury Act, 1911..224.

Plaice, investigations into fisheries of, 342-344.

Pollock, Sir Frederick, 'The Expansion of the Common Law,' extract from, 229.

Polzer-Hoditz, Arthur, Count, 'The Emperor Karl,' 404-405.

Ponsonby, Sir Frederick, extract from his 'Letters of Empress Frederick,' 9.

Pontopidan, Rishop, 'The Natural History of Norway,' 236.

'Pravda,' official organ of the Communist Party, extracts from, 93-94.

Prior, Mr, the Royal Dublin Society, 64, 66, 67, 77—his 'An Authentic Narrative of the Success of Tar-water,' 68.

Privateers, French, help given to Jacobite cause by, 317, 319, 322, 324—financial losses of, 324-325—their part in the Forty-Five, 325-331.

Q.

'Quarterly Review' of 1839-40, allusion to two articles in, 209.

Queen Victoria, 1-21.

Quick, R. H., 'Essays on Educational Reformers,' 96—on Roger Ascham, 106.

R.

R 101 and Afterwards, 178-191.

Radcliffe, Sir G., writer of Biographical notes to 'Letters and Despatches of the Earl of Strafford,' 360.

Radford, Lewis B., the Bishop of Goulburn, N. S. W., 'Roger Ascham,' 96.

Real Joan of Arc, The, 249-260.

Renton, A. Wood, 'The Mandates System: Its First Decade,' 261.

Renwick, Professor W. A., editor of 'The Shepherd's Calendar,' 411-412.

Retreat of 1914, The, and the Battle of the Marne, 22-39.

Roger Ascham, 96-110.

Rollin, 'La Pratique des Mandats,' 265 *note*, 276 *note*.

Rosebery, Earl of, 3, 18-19.

Royal Dublin Society, The, and its Bicentenary, 63-77.

Royal Dublin Society, foundation of, 64—activities, 65, 70-71—non-political, 68-69—expansion, 70—recent problems of, 72-73—relations with the present Irish Government, 75-76.

Rushworth, John, editor of 'The Tryal of the Earl of Strafford,' 360.

Ruskin, John, 211.

Russia and the Five Years' Plan, 78-95.

Russia, education in, 80, 82—influence of the Orthodox Church, 81-82—economic development, 83, 87-90—agriculture, 85-86—methods of finance, 87—trade relations with foreign countries, 90-91, 93—unemployment, 91-92—effect of her exports on world markets, 92-93.

S.

Sackville, Sir Richard, on Roger Ascham, 99, 103.

Sadler, Sir Michael, introduction to 'Towards a New Education,' 51.

St Augustine, allusion to 'De Civitate Dei,' 177.

St Bernard, his writings, 170—influence, 172.

St Germain, Treaty of, its effects upon Austria, 151-152, 154, 157.

St Kilda, Past and Present, 132-149.

St Kilda, situation of, 132—ownership of, 134—physical characteristics, 134-135—animal and bird life, 135-139—population, 145—trade, 146—Parliament of, 149.

Salisbury, Marquis of, 4 *et seq.*

Salter, Dr Emma Gurney, 'Tudor England through Venetian Eyes,' 202.

Satyagraha, Mr Gandhi's fight for, 393, 398.

Saunders, H. W., 'Introduction to the Rolls of Norwich Cathedral Priory,' 111, 130.

Science, the film as an aid to the teaching of, 58-59.

Scottish Jacobites and French Privateers, 315-331.

Sea Monsters, 236-248.

Sea monsters, incredulity as to their existence, 236-238, 242, 244—evidence of their existence, 238-246, 248—characteristics, 240, 241-242.

Selby, on the migration of the woodcock, 306.

Selden, on Monasticism, 162-163.

Shaw, George Bernard, 'The Apple Cart,' 76 *note*—on private property, 216—'Saint Joan: a Chronicle Play in Six Scenes and an Epilogue,' 249 *et seq.*

Sheridan, Thomas, 68.

'Shooting Times,' extract from, on the woodcock, 319.

Simpson, Dr Douglas, 'Julian the Apostate,' 196-197.

Smith, Adam, principles of, 205, 206—'The Wealth of Nations,' 207.

Smith, Professor Goldwin, on Stratford, 374.

Smuts, General, 'The League of Nations,' 265-266.

Social Democratic Federation, foundation of, 213, 214—failure of, 218.

Socialism, the Decline and Fall of, 205-222.

Socialism, foundations of, 208—the word introduced to literature by the 'Quarterly Review,' 209—growth of, in England, 213, 214-215, 219—causes of its decline, 216-217, 220-222.

Socialist Administrations, in England, 219-220.

Soldiers' Slang, 347-359.

Spears, Brig.-General E. L., 'Liaison, 1914'..22—extracts from, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31 *note*, 38-39.

Spencer, Herbert, 'The Man versus the State,' 205, 215—on the Liberal Party, 218.

Squire, Mr J. C., introduction to the 'Last Poems' of John Freeman, 204.

Stebbing, E. P., 'The Forestry Commission in Great Britain,' 377.

Stephen, Leslie, on government by the economists, 211.

Stoll, Mr Elmer Edgar, 'Poets and Playrights,' 412-413.

Stoyanovsky, J., 'The Mandate for Palestine,' 277 *note*.

Strafford, 360-376.

Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of, characteristics of, 360-361, 376—early career of, 363-364—Parliamentary activities of, 364-366—his belief in Parliamentary Government, 367-368—his rule in the north of England, 369-370—extracts from writings of, 369-370—his rule in Ireland, 370-375—extract from his address to his first Irish Parliament, 371.

Strong, Professor, on the ideas of Roger Ascham, 106.

Stuart, Miss Dorothy M., 'Christina Rossetti,' 411.

'Sunday Times, The,' for Dec. 7, 1930, extract from, 224-225.

Syria and Lebanon, conditions of French Mandate for, 269-271.

T.

Tennyson, Alfred Lord, 1-2.

The Future of Austria, 150-158.

The Mandates System: Its First Decade, 261-278.

The Meaning of Monasticism, 159-177.

Thompson, C. J. S., 'The Mystery and Lore of Monsters,' 236.

Thomson, Miss Gladys Scott, 'Two Centuries of Family History,' 402-403.

Thorburn, on the habits of the woodcock, 310.

'Times, The,' for Nov. 21, 1930, report of lecture by Hon. Mr Justice McCardie on 'Truth,' 223—for Jan. 21, 1931, extract from, 225.

Togo, conditions of British and French Mandates for, 271-272.

Tomlinson, Mr H. M., 'Illusion; 1915,' 193.

Traill, H. D., 'Strafford,' 360, 361.

Trevelyan, Mr G. M., 1.

U.

'United States Naval Institute Proceedings, Journal of the,' August 1930.. 189 *note*.

Vol. 256.—No. 508.

V.

Vane, Sir Harry, his responsibility for the impeachment of Strafford, 375.

Vasiliev, Professor A. V., extract from his 'Time, Space, and Motion,' 70 *note*.

Victoria, Queen, 1-21.

Victoria, H.M. Queen, the embodiment of her age, 1-2—constitutional aspects of her anti-Home Rule activity, 4-7—distrust of Russia, 8—relations with the Emperor William II and Bismarck, 8-11—her interest in India, 12—indomitable energy, 13—relations with her Ministers, 14-15—in dispute about Commander-in-Chief, 15-16—interest in Church appointments, 16-17—intervention in political appointments, 18—appreciation of the Prince of Wales, 19—her greatness, 21.

Vienna, effects of the Treaty of St Germain upon, 151-152—in the hands of the Socialists, 153.

W.

Wallas, Mr Graham, on the will to work, 217.

Wallon, H., 'Jeanne d'Arc,' 249.

Walton, Mr, of the Royal Dublin Society, 64.

Warburton, Richard, of the Royal Dublin Society, 64.

Ward, Judge, of the Royal Dublin Society, 64.

Waters, Brig.-General W. H. H., C.M.G., 'Russia and the Five Years' Plan,' 78.

Wavell, Brig.-Gen. A. P., C.M.G., M.C., 351 *note*.

Weekley, Professor Ernest, 'An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English,' 347—extract from Preface to, 347—references to, 348 *et seq*.

Whales, proposed limitation of slaughter of, 346.

William II, ex-German Emperor, 3, 8, 10, 11, 20.

Wilson, President Woodrow, on Mandates, 264.

'Winthrop Papers, The,' vol. I, 1498-1628.. 111, 130.

Wister, Owen, 'Theodore Roosevelt,'
192-193.

Woodcock, Concerning the, 302-
314.

Woodcock, need for preservation of,
302-304—migratory habits of, 304-
307—question of carrying its young,
307-314.

Wright, Professor Joseph, allusions
to his 'English Dialect Dictionary,'
350, 353.

Wright, Mr Thomas, 'Life of Edward
FitzGerald,' 290.

Wright, William Aldis, editor of
'English Works of Roger Ascham,'
96—editor of 'Letters and Lite-

rary Remains of Edward Fitz-
Gerald,' 279, 289-290—'Letters
to Fanny Kemble,' 290—'More
Letters,' 290.

Y.

Young, Arthur, his 'Tour of Ireland,'
66.

Younge, Dr C. M., 'A Year on the
Great Barrier Reef,' 408.

Z.

Zachrisson, Professor R. E., 'Anglic,'
408-409.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH VOLUME.

